arXiv:0804.2116v1 [math-ph] 14 Apr 2008

On Universality of Bulk Local Regime of the Deformed Gaussian Unitary Ensemble

T. Shcherbina
Institute for Low Temperature Physics, Kharkov, Ukraine.
E-mail: t_shcherbina@rambler.ru

Abstract

We consider the deformed Gaussian Ensemble $H_n = M_n + H_n^{(0)}$ in which $H_n^{(0)}$ is a diagonal Hermitian matrix and M_n is the Gaussian Unitary Ensemble (GUE) random matrix. Assuming that the Normalized Counting Measure of $H_n^{(0)}$ (both non-random and random) converges weakly to a measure $N^{(0)}$ with a bounded support we prove universality of the local eigenvalue statistics in the bulk of the limiting spectrum of H_n.

1 Introduction.

Universality is an important topic of the random matrix theory. It deals with statistical properties of eigenvalues of $n\times n$ random matrices on intervals whose length tends to zero as $n\to\infty$. According to the universality hypothesis these properties do not depend to large extent on the ensemble. The hypothesis was formulated in the early 60s and since then was proved in certain cases. There are some results only for special cases. Best of all universality is studied in the case of ensembles with a unitary invariant probability distribution (known also as unitary matrix models) ([1, 2, 3]).

To formulate the universality hypothesis we need some notations and definitions. Denote by $\lambda_1^{(n)},\dots,\lambda_n^{(n)}$ the eigenvalues of the random matrix. Define the normalized eigenvalue counting measure (NCM) of the matrix as

$$N_n(\triangle) = \sharp\{\lambda_j^{(n)} \in \triangle, j = \overline{1,n}\}/n, \quad N_n(\mathbb{R}) = 1, \tag{1.1}$$

where $\triangle$ is an arbitrary interval of the real axis. For many known random matrices the expectation $\overline{N}_n = \mathbf{E}\{N_n\}$ is absolutely continuous, i.e.,

$$\overline{N}_n(\triangle) = \int\limits_{\triangle} \rho_n(\lambda)d\,\lambda. \tag{1.2}$$

The non-negative function ρ_n in (1.2) is called the density of states.

Define also the m-point correlation function $R_m^{(n)}$ by the equality:

$$\mathbf{E}\left\{\sum_{j_1\ne\ldots\ne j_m}\varphi_m(\lambda_{j_1},\dots,\lambda_{j_m})\right\} = \int \varphi_m(\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_m)R_m^{(n)}(\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_m)d\lambda_1,\dots,d\lambda_m, \tag{1.3}$$

where $\varphi_m : \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{C}$ is bounded, continuous and symmetric in its arguments and the summation is over all m-tuples of distinct integers $j_1, \dots, j_m = \overline{1,n}$. Here and below integrals without limits denote the integration over the whole real axis.

The global regime of the random matrix theory, centered around weak convergence of the normalized counting measure of eigenvalues, is well-studied for many ensembles. It is shown that N_n converges weakly to a non-random limiting measure N known as the integrated density of states (IDS). The IDS is normalized to unity and is absolutely continuous

$$N(\mathbb{R}) = 1, \quad N(\triangle) = \int\limits_{\triangle} \rho(\lambda) d\,\lambda. \tag{1.4}$$

The non-negative function ρ in (1.4) is called the limiting density of states of the ensemble.

We will call the spectrum the support of N and define the bulk of the spectrum as

$$\operatorname{bulk} N = \{\lambda | \exists (a,b) \subset \operatorname{supp} N : \lambda \in (a,b),\ \rho_n(\mu) \rightrightarrows \rho(\mu) \text{ on } (a,b), \rho(\lambda) \neq 0\}. \tag{1.5}$$

Then the universality hypothesis on the bulk of the spectrum says that for $\lambda_0 \in \operatorname{bulk} N$ we have:

(i) for any fixed m uniformly in $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m$ varying in any compact set in $\mathbb{R}$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{(n\rho_n(\lambda_0))^m} R_m^{(n)} \left(\lambda_0 + \frac{x_1}{\rho_n(\lambda_0)\,n}, \dots, \lambda_0 + \frac{x_m}{\rho_n(\lambda_0)\,n}\right) = \det\{S(x_i - x_j)\}_{i,j=1}^m, \tag{1.6}$$

where

$$S(x_i - x_j) = \frac{\sin \pi(x_i - x_j)}{\pi(x_i - x_j)}, \tag{1.7}$$

and $R_m^{(n)}$, ρ_n, and ρ are defined in (1.3), (1.2) and (1.4);

(ii) if

$$E_n(\triangle) = \mathbf{P}\{\lambda_i^{(n)} \notin \triangle,\, i = \overline{1,n}\}, \tag{1.8}$$

is the gap probability, then

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} E_n\left(\left[\lambda_0 + \frac{a}{\rho_n(\lambda_0)\,n}, \lambda_0 + \frac{b}{\rho_n(\lambda_0)\,n}\right]\right) = \det\{1 - S_{a,b}\}, \tag{1.9}$$

where the operator $S_{a,b}$ is defined on $L_2[a,b]$ by the formula

$$S_{a,b} f(x) = \int\limits_a^b S(x-y) f(y) d\,y,$$

and S is defined in (1.7).

In this paper we study universality of the local bulk regime of random matrices of the deformed Gaussian Unitary Ensemble (GUE)

$$H_n = M_n + H_n^{(0)}, \tag{1.10}$$

where $H_n^{(0)}$ is a Hermitian matrix with eigenvalues $\{h_j^{(n)}\}_{j=1}^n$ and M_n is the GUE matrix, defined as

$$M_n = n^{-1/2} W_n, \tag{1.11}$$

where W_n is a Hermitian $n \times n$ matrix whose elements $\Re w_{jk}$ and $\Im w_{jk}$ are independent Gaussian random variables such that

$$\mathbf{E}\{\Re w_{jk}\} = \mathbf{E}\{\Im w_{jk}\} = 0, \quad \mathbf{E}\{\Re^2 w_{jk}\} = \mathbf{E}\{\Im^2 w_{jk}\} = \frac{1}{2} \quad (j \neq k), \quad \mathbf{E}\{w_{jj}^2\} = 1. \tag{1.12}$$

Let

$$N_n^{(0)}(\triangle) = \sharp\{h_j^{(n)} \in \triangle, j = \overline{1,n}\}/n.$$

be the Normalized Counting Measure of eigenvalues of $H_n^{(0)}$.

Note also that since the probability law of M_n is unitary invariant we can assume without loss of generality that $H_n^{(0)}$ is diagonal.

The global regime for the ensemble (1.10)-(1.12) is well enough studied. In particular, it was shown in [4] that if $N_n^{(0)}$ converges weakly with probability 1 to a non-random measure $N^{(0)}$ as $n \to \infty$, then N_n also converges weakly with probability 1 to a non-random measure N. Moreover the Stieltjes transforms g of N and $g^{(0)}$ of $N^{(0)}$ satisfy the equation

$$g(z) = g^{(0)}(z + g(z)).$$

It follows from the definition (1.1) and the above result that any n-independent interval Δ of spectral axis such that $N(\Delta) > 0$ contains $O(n)$ eigenvalues. Thus, to deal with a finite number of eigenvalues as $n \to \infty$, in particular, with the gap probability, one has to consider spectral intervals, whose length tends to zero as $n \to \infty$. In particular, in the local bulk regime we are about intervals of the length $O(n^{-1})$.

Random matrix theory posseses a powerful techniques of analysis of the local regime, based on the so called determinant formulas for the correlation functions [5]. For the GUE, more general for the hermitian matrix models, the determinant formulas follow from the possibility to write the joint probability density of its eigenvalues as the square of the determinant, formed by certain orthogonal polynomials and then as the determinant formed by reproducing kernel of the polynomials, that.are also heavily used in the subsequent asymptotic analysis [1, 2, 3]. Unfortunately, the orthogonal polynomials have not appeared so far in the study of the deformed Gaussian Unitary Ensemble. However, it was shown in physical papers [6, 7, 8] that correlation functions of the deformed Gaussian Unitary Ensemble can be written in the determinant form, although the corresponding kernel is not, in general, a reproducing kernel of a system of orthogonal polynomials. This was done by using as a crucial step the Harish-Chandra/Itzykson-Zuber formula for certain integrals over the unitary group.

This important result was used in [9] to prove universality of the local bulk regime of matrices (1.10), where $H_n^{(0)} = n^{-1/2} W_n$ is a hermitian random matrix with independent (modulo symmetry) entries:

$$\begin{aligned} W_n &= \{w_{jk}\}_{j,k}^n, \ w_{jk} = \overline{w_{kj}} \\ \mathbf{E}\{w_{jk}\} &= \mathbf{E}\{w_{jk}^2\} = 0, \ \mathbf{E}\{|w_{jk}|^2\} = 1, \ \sup_{j,k} \mathbf{E}\{|w_{jk}|^p\} < \infty. \end{aligned} \tag{1.13}$$

It was proved in [9] that if $p > 2(m+2)$, then (1.6) is valid, and if $p > 6$, then (1.9) is valid.

Later in the series of the papers [10, 11] the special case of (1.10) was studied, where $H_n^{(0)}$ has two eigenvalues $\pm a$ of equal multiplicity. In this case universality in the bulk and at the edge of the spectrum were proved.

In this paper we consider random matrices (1.10) for a rather general class of $H_n^{(0)}$ both random and nonrandom. The main results are the following theorems.

Theorem 1. *Let* $N_n^{(0)}$ *be a nonrandom measure that converges weakly to a measure* $N^{(0)}$ *with a bounded support. Then for any* $\lambda_0 \in \operatorname{bulk} N$ *the universality properties (1.6) and (1.9) hold.*

Theorem 2. *Let the eigenvalues* $\{h_j^{(n)}\}_{j=1}^n$ *of* $H_n^{(0)}$ *in (1.10) be a collection of random variables independent of* W_n *and such that* $\mathbf{E}^{(h)}\{|h_j^{(n)}|^2\} < \infty$ *(the symbol* $\mathbf{E}^{(h)}\{\ldots\}$ *denotes the expectation with respect to the measure generated by* $H_n^{(0)}$*). Assume that there exists a non-random measure* $N^{(0)}$ *of a bounded support such that for any finite interval* $\Delta \subset \mathbb{R}$ *and for any* $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbf{P}\{|N^{(0)}(\Delta) - N_n^{(0)}(\Delta)| > \varepsilon\} = 0.$$

Then for any $\lambda_0 \in \operatorname{bulk} N$ *the universality properties (1.6) and (1.9) hold.*

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we give a new proof of determinant formulas for correlation functions (1.3) by the method which is different from those of [6, 7], [9] and [10, 11]. Namely we use the representation of the resolvent of the random matrix via the integral with respect to the Grassmann variables. The integral was introduced by Berezin (see [13]) and widely used in physics literature (see e.g. book [14]). For the reader convenience we give in Appendix a brief account of the Grassmann integral techniques that we will use in the paper. Theorem 1 will be proved in Sections $3-4$. Section 5 deals with the proof of Theorem 2.

2 The determinant formulas.

It is well-known (see for example [5]) that the correlation functions (1.3) for the GUE can be written in the determinant form

$$R_m^{(n)}(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_m) = \det\{K_n(\lambda_i, \lambda_j)\}, \tag{2.1}$$

with

$$K_n(\lambda_i, \lambda_j) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \phi_k(\lambda_i)\phi_k(\lambda_j), \quad \phi_k(x) = n^{1/4} h_k(\sqrt{n}x) e^{-nx^2/4},$$

where $\{h_k\}_{k\ge 0}$ are orthonormal Hermite polynomials. We want to find analogs of these formulas in the case of random matrices (1.10).

Proposition 1. *Let* H_n *be the random matrix defined in (1.10) and* $R_m^{(n)}$ *be the correlation function (1.3). Then (2.1) is valid with*

$$K_n(\lambda, \mu) = -n \int_L \frac{dt}{2\pi} \oint_C \frac{dv}{2\pi} \frac{\exp\left\{-\frac{n}{2}(v^2 - 2v\lambda - t^2 + 2\mu t)\right\}}{v - t} \prod_{j=1}^n \left(\frac{t - h_j^{(n)}}{v - h_j^{(n)}}\right), \tag{2.2}$$

where L *is a line parallel to the imaginary axis and lying to the left of all* $\{h_j^{(n)}\}_{j=1}^n$*, and the closed contour* C *has all* $\{h_j^{(n)}\}_{j=1}^n$ *inside and does not intersect* L.

Representation (2.2) was first obtained in physical papers [6, 7]. We obtain this representation by use the Grassmann integration.

Proof. Following [12], where the GUE was studied, denote

$$F(z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_m) = \mathbf{E}\left\{\prod_{k=1}^{m} \mathrm{Tr}\,\frac{1}{H_n - z_k}\right\}, \tag{2.3}$$

where $\{z_j\}_{j=1}^{m}$ are distinct complex numbers, $\Im z_1 = \ldots = \Im z_m = -\varepsilon < 0$. It is technically easier to study the ratio of the determinants instead of $\mathrm{Tr}\dfrac{1}{H_n - z}$. Denote

$$D(z_1, \ldots, z_m; x_1, \ldots, x_m) = \frac{\det(H_n - z_1 - x_1) \ldots \det(H_n - z_m - x_m)}{\det(H_n - z_1) \ldots \det(H_n - z_m)}. \tag{2.4}$$

Since

$$-\frac{d}{d\,x}\frac{\det(H_n - z - x)}{\det(H_n - z)}\bigg|_{x=0} = \mathrm{Tr}\,(H_n - z)^{-1},$$

then

$$F(z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_m) = \frac{\partial^m}{\partial x_1 \ldots \partial x_m}\mathbf{E}\left\{D(z_1, \ldots, z_m; x_1, \ldots, x_m)\right\}\bigg|_{x_1 = \cdots = x_m = 0}. \tag{2.5}$$

Here and below the symbol $\mathbf{E}\{\ldots\}$ denotes the expectation with respect to the measure generated by W (see (1.12)).

By using formulas (5.5) and (5.6), we obtain:

$$D(z_1, \ldots, z_m; x_1, \ldots, x_m) = \int \exp\left\{-i\sum_{\alpha=1}^{m}\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}w_{j,k} + \delta_{j,k}(h_j^{(n)} - z_\alpha)\right)\overline{\psi}_{j,\alpha}\psi_{k,\alpha}\right\}$$
$$\times \exp\left\{-i\sum_{\alpha=1}^{m}\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}w_{j,k} + \delta_{j,k}(h_j^{(n)} - z_\alpha - x_\alpha)\right)\overline{\phi}_{j,\alpha}\phi_{k,\alpha}\right\}\prod_{j=1}^{n} d\,\Phi_j,$$

where $\{\psi_{j,\alpha}\}_{j=1,\alpha=1}^{n\,m}$ are the Grassmann variables (n variables for each determinant in the numerator), $\{\phi_{j,\alpha}\}_{j=1,\alpha=1}^{n\,m}$ are complex ones (n variables for each determinant in the denominator), $\Phi_j = (\phi_{j,1}, \ldots, \phi_{j,m}, \psi_{j,1}, \ldots, \psi_{j,m})^t$ and

$$d\,\Phi_j = \frac{1}{\pi^m}\prod_{\alpha=1}^{m}\left(d\,\overline{\psi}_{j,\alpha} d\,\psi_{j,\alpha} d\,\Re\phi_{j,\alpha} d\,\Im\phi_{j,\alpha}\right).$$

Collecting separately the terms with $\Re w_{j,k}$ and $\Im w_{j,k}$ we get

$$\int \exp\left\{i\sum_{\alpha=1}^{m}\sum_{j=1}^{n}(z_\alpha - h_j^{(n)})\overline{\psi}_{j,\alpha}\psi_{j,\alpha} + i\sum_{\alpha=1}^{m}\sum_{j=1}^{n}(z_\alpha + x_\alpha - h_j^{(n)})\overline{\phi}_{j,\alpha}\phi_{j,\alpha}\right\}$$
$$\times \exp\left\{-\frac{i}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{j<k}\Re w_{j,k}\left(\Phi_j^+\Phi_k + \Phi_k^+\Phi_j\right)\right\} \times \exp\left\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{j<k}\Im w_{j,k}\left(\Phi_j^+\Phi_k - \Phi_k^+\Phi_j\right)\right\}$$
$$\times \exp\left\{-\frac{i}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{j} w_{j,j}\left(\Psi_j^+\Psi_j + \Phi_j^+\Phi_j\right)\right\}\prod_{j=1}^{n} d\,\Phi_j. \tag{2.6}$$

Denote by $\exp\{f\}$ the first exponential. Integrating with respect to the measure generated by W, we obtain after some calculations

$$\mathbf{E}\left\{D(z_1,\ldots,z_m;x_1,\ldots,x_m)\right\} \\ = \int \exp\{f\}\cdot\exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2n}\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}\left(\Phi_j^+\Phi_k\right)\left(\Phi_k^+\Phi_j\right)\right\}\prod_{j=1}^{n} d\Phi_j. \quad (2.7)$$

We will use below the following standart

Lemma 1 (Hubbard-Stratonovitch transformation)**.** *We have in the above notations:*

$$\exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2n}\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}\left(\Phi_j^+\Phi_k\right)\left(\Phi_k^+\Phi_j\right)\right\} = \int\exp\left\{-\frac{n}{2}strQ^2\right\}\prod_{j=1}^{n}\exp\{-i\Phi_j^+Q\Phi_j\}d\,Q, \quad (2.8)$$

where

$$Q = \left(\begin{array}{cc} a & \sigma \\ \sigma^+ & ib \end{array}\right),$$

$a=\{a_{j,k}\}_{j,k=1}^m$*,* $b=\{b_{j,k}\}_{j,k=1}^m$ *are* $m\times m$ *Hermitian ordinary matrices,* $\sigma=\{\sigma_{j,k}\}_{j,k=1}^m$ *is a* $m\times m$ *matrix consisting of Grassmann variables (*σ^+ *is its Hermitian conjugate), and*

$$d\,Q = \frac{1}{\pi^{m^2}}\prod_{j=1}^{m}d\,a_{j,j}d\,b_{j,j}\prod_{j<k}d\,\Re a_{j,k}d\,\Im a_{j,k}d\,\Re b_{j,k}d\,\Im b_{j,k}\prod_{j,k=1}^{m}d\,\overline{\sigma}_{j,k}d\,\sigma_{j,k}.$$

Proof. Define

$$s^{(\psi)}_{\alpha,\beta} = \sum_{j=1}^{n}\overline{\psi}_{j,\alpha}\psi_{j,\beta},\quad s^{(\phi)}_{\alpha,\beta} = \sum_{j=1}^{n}\overline{\phi}_{j,\alpha}\phi_{j,\beta},\quad s^{(\psi,\phi)}_{\alpha,\beta} = \sum_{j=1}^{n}\overline{\psi}_{j,\alpha}\phi_{j,\beta},\quad s^{(\phi,\psi)}_{\alpha,\beta} = \sum_{j=1}^{n}\psi_{j,\alpha}\overline{\phi}_{j,\beta}.$$

Write the sum at the exponent as:

$$-\frac{1}{2n}\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}\left(\Phi_j^+\Phi_k\right)\left(\Phi_k^+\Phi_j\right) = -\frac{1}{2n}\sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^{m}s^{(\psi,\phi)}_{\alpha,\beta}\cdot s^{(\phi,\psi)}_{\alpha,\beta} \\ -\frac{1}{2n}\sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^{m}s^{(\psi,\phi)}_{\beta,\alpha}\cdot s^{(\phi,\psi)}_{\beta,\alpha} - \frac{1}{2n}\sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^{m}s^{(\psi)}_{\alpha,\beta}\cdot s^{(\psi)}_{\beta,\alpha} - \frac{1}{2n}\sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^{m}s^{(\phi)}_{\alpha,\beta}\cdot s^{(\phi)}_{\beta,\alpha} \quad (2.9)$$

Now, use (5.5) to obtain:

$$\int\prod_{\alpha<\beta}\frac{d\,\Im b_{\alpha,\beta}d\,\Re b_{\alpha,\beta}}{\pi}\prod_{\alpha}\frac{d\,b_{\alpha,\alpha}}{\pi}\exp\left\{\sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^{m}b_{\alpha\beta}s^{(\psi)}_{\alpha,\beta} - n\sum_{\alpha<\beta}\overline{b}_{\alpha,\beta}b_{\alpha,\beta} - \frac{n}{2}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{m}b^2_{\alpha,\alpha}\right\} \\ = \int\prod_{\alpha<\beta}\frac{d\,\Im b_{\alpha,\beta}d\,\Re b_{\alpha,\beta}}{\pi}\exp\left\{\sum_{\alpha<\beta}^{m}\Re b_{\alpha\beta}\left(s^{(\psi)}_{\alpha,\beta}+s^{(\psi)}_{\beta,\alpha}\right)\right\} \\ \times\exp\left\{i\sum_{\alpha<\beta}^{m}\Im b_{\alpha\beta}\left(s^{(\psi)}_{\alpha,\beta}-s^{(\psi)}_{\beta,\alpha}\right) - n\sum_{\alpha<\beta}\overline{b}_{\alpha,\beta}b_{\alpha,\beta} - \frac{n}{2}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{m}b^2_{\alpha,\alpha}\right\} \\ = \left(\sqrt{\frac{2}{n}}\right)^{m}\left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{n}}\right)^{m(m-1)}\exp\left\{\frac{1}{2n}\sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^{m}s^{(\psi)}_{\alpha,\beta}s^{(\psi)}_{\beta,\alpha}\right\}$$

Similar argument yields the formulas

$$\begin{aligned}\int \prod_{\alpha<\beta} \frac{d\,\Im a_{\alpha,\beta} d\,\Re a_{\alpha,\beta}}{\pi} \prod_{\alpha} \frac{d\,a_{\alpha,\alpha}}{\pi} \exp\left\{-i\sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^{m} a_{\alpha\beta} s^{(\phi)}_{\alpha,\beta} - n\sum_{\alpha<\beta} \overline{a}_{\alpha,\beta} a_{\alpha,\beta} - \frac{n}{2}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{m} a^2_{\alpha,\alpha}\right\} \\ = \left(\sqrt{\frac{2}{n}}\right)^{m} \left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{n}}\right)^{m(m-1)} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2n}\sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^{m} s^{(\phi)}_{\alpha,\beta} s^{(\phi)}_{\beta,\alpha}\right\}\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}&\int \prod_{\alpha,\beta=1}^{m} d\,\eta_{\alpha,\beta} d\,\eta_{\alpha,\beta} \exp\left\{\sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^{m} \eta_{\alpha\beta} s^{(\psi,\phi)}_{\alpha,\beta} + \sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^{m} \overline{\eta}_{\alpha\beta} s^{(\phi,\psi)}_{\alpha,\beta} - n\sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^{m} \overline{\eta}_{\alpha,\beta}\eta_{\alpha,\beta}\right\} \\ &= \prod_{\alpha,\beta=1}^{m} \int d\,\eta_{\alpha,\beta} d\,\eta_{\alpha,\beta} \left(1 + \eta_{\alpha,\beta} s^{(\psi,\phi)}_{\alpha,\beta} + \overline{\eta}_{\alpha,\beta} s^{(\phi,\psi)}_{\alpha,\beta} - n\overline{\eta}_{\alpha,\beta}\eta_{\alpha,\beta} + \overline{\eta}_{\alpha,\beta}\eta_{\alpha,\beta} s^{(\psi,\phi)}_{\alpha,\beta} s^{(\phi,\psi)}_{\alpha,\beta}\right) \\ &= n^{m^2} \prod_{\alpha,\beta=1}^{m} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n} s^{(\psi,\phi)}_{\alpha,\beta} s^{(\phi,\psi)}_{\alpha,\beta}\right) = n^{m^2} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{n} s^{(\psi,\phi)}_{\alpha,\beta} s^{(\phi,\psi)}_{\alpha,\beta}\right\},\end{aligned}$$

where we used (5.6) to obtain the last formula. Collecting together three above formulas, we present the l.h.s. of (2.8) as

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{2^m}\int \prod_{\alpha,\beta=1}^{m} d\,\eta_{\alpha,\beta} d\,\eta_{\alpha,\beta} \prod_{\alpha<\beta} \frac{d\,\Im a_{\alpha,\beta} d\,\Re a_{\alpha,\beta}}{\pi} \prod_{\alpha} \frac{d\,a_{\alpha,\alpha}}{\pi} \prod_{\alpha<\beta} \frac{d\,\Im b_{\alpha,\beta} d\,\Re b_{\alpha,\beta}}{\pi} \prod_{\alpha} \frac{d\,b_{\alpha,\alpha}}{\pi} \\ &\times \exp\left\{\sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^{m} a_{\alpha\beta} s^{(\psi)}_{\alpha,\beta} + i\sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^{m} b_{\alpha\beta} s^{(\phi)}_{\alpha,\beta} + \sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^{m} \eta_{\alpha\beta} s^{(\psi,\phi)}_{\alpha,\beta} + \sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^{m} \overline{\eta}_{\alpha\beta} s^{(\phi,\psi)}_{\alpha,\beta}\right\} \\ &\times \exp\left\{-\frac{n}{2}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{m}(a^2_{\alpha\alpha} + b^2_{\alpha\alpha}) - n\sum_{\alpha<\beta}(\overline{a}_{\alpha\beta}a_{\alpha\beta} + \overline{b}_{\alpha\beta}b_{\alpha\beta}) - n\sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^{m} \overline{\eta}_{\alpha\beta}\eta_{\alpha\beta}\right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{2^m}\int \exp\left\{-\frac{n}{2}\operatorname{str} Q^2\right\} \prod_{j=1}^{n} \exp\{-i\Phi_j^+ Q\Phi_j\} d\,Q,\end{aligned}$$

where the matrix Q is described in the lemma. □

The above allows us to rewrite the integral in the r.h.s. of (2.7) as:

$$\frac{1}{2^m}\int \exp\{f\} \cdot \prod_{j=1}^{n} d\,\Phi_j \cdot \exp\left\{-\frac{n}{2}\operatorname{str} Q^2\right\} \prod_{j=1}^{n} \exp\{-i\Phi_j^+ Q\Phi_j\} d\,Q. \tag{2.10}$$

Setting

$$\Lambda = \begin{pmatrix} z_1 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & z_2 & \dots & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & z_n & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & z_1 + x_1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & 0 & z_2 + x_2 & \dots & 0 \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & z_n + x_n \end{pmatrix},$$

and using the explicit form of $\exp\{f\}$, we obtain from (2.10)

$$\frac{1}{2^m}\int \prod_{j=1}^{n} d\,\Phi_j \cdot \exp\left\{-\frac{n}{2}\operatorname{str} Q^2\right\} \prod_{j=1}^{n} \exp\{-i\Phi_j^+ (Q - \Lambda + h_j I)\Phi_j\} d\,Q. \tag{2.11}$$

Recall now that $\Im z_1 = \ldots = \Im z_m = -\varepsilon < 0$. Hence, $\Lambda = \Lambda_1 - \varepsilon\, I$, where Λ_1 is a matrix, whose entries are the real parts of the entries of Λ.

We integrate (2.11) with respect to ψ and ϕ by using (5.7), as a result the integral (2.7) is equal to

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2^m}\int \exp\Big\{-\frac{n}{2}\mathrm{str}\, Q^2\Big\}\prod_{j=1}^{n}\mathrm{sdet}\,(Q-\Lambda+h_jI)^{-1}d\,Q\\
&\qquad= \frac{1}{2^m}\int \exp\Big\{-\frac{n}{2}\mathrm{str}\, Q^2\Big\}\prod_{j=1}^{n}\mathrm{sdet}\,(Q-\Lambda_1+\varepsilon\cdot I+h_jI)^{-1}d\,Q\\
&\qquad\quad= \frac{1}{2^m}\int \exp\Big\{-\frac{n}{2}\mathrm{str}(Q+\Lambda_1)^2\Big\}\prod_{j=1}^{n}\mathrm{sdet}(Q+\varepsilon\cdot I+h_jI)^{-1}d\,Q \qquad (2.12)
\end{aligned}$$

Write $Q = U^{-1}SU$, where U is a unitary super-matrix and the matrix S is

$$S = \begin{pmatrix} S_1 & 0\\ 0 & S_2\end{pmatrix},$$

where

$$S_1 = \begin{pmatrix} s_1 & 0 & \ldots & 0 & 0\\ 0 & s_2 & 0 & \ldots & 0\\ \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots\\ 0 & 0 & \ldots & 0 & s_n\end{pmatrix}, \quad S_2 = \begin{pmatrix} it_1 & 0 & \ldots & 0 & 0\\ 0 & it_2 & 0 & \ldots & 0\\ \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots\\ 0 & 0 & \ldots & 0 & it_n\end{pmatrix}.$$

Use the super-analog (5.14) of the Itzykson-Zuber formula for the integration over the unitary group (see [12]). This yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{E}\left\{D(z_1,\ldots,z_m;x_1,\ldots,x_m)\right\} = 1-\chi(x_1,\ldots,x_m)\\
&+\frac{(-2\pi)^{-m}n^m}{B_m(\Lambda)}\int \exp\Big\{-\frac{n}{2}\mathrm{str}(S+\Lambda_1)^2\Big\}\prod_{j=1}^{n}\prod_{\alpha=1}^{m}\left(\frac{it_\alpha+i\,\varepsilon+h_j^{(n)}}{s_\alpha+i\,\varepsilon+h_j^{(n)}}\right)\cdot B_m(S)\prod_{\alpha=1}^{m}d\,t_\alpha d\,s_\alpha,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.13}$$

where $B_m(S)$ is the Cauchy determinant (5.13).

Using the formula for the Cauchy determinant, we obtain that

$$B_m(\Lambda)^{-1} = \prod_{\alpha=1}^{m} x_\alpha\prod_{\alpha>\beta}\frac{(z_\alpha-z_\beta)(z_\alpha+x_\alpha-z_\beta-x_\beta)}{(z_\alpha-z_\beta-x_\beta)(z_\beta-z_\alpha-x_\alpha)}.$$

Substituting this to (2.13), differentiating (2.13) with respect to every x_α and putting then $x_1 = \ldots = x_m = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\partial^m}{\partial x_1\ldots\partial x_m}\mathbf{E}\left\{D(z_1,\ldots,z_m;x_1,\ldots,x_m)\right\}\Bigg|_{x_1=\cdots=x_m=0}\\
&= \frac{n^m}{(-2\pi)^m}\int \exp\Big\{-\frac{n}{2}\mathrm{str}(S+\widetilde{\Lambda})^2\Big\}\prod_{j=1}^{n}\prod_{\alpha=1}^{m}\left(\frac{it_\alpha^{+}+h_j^{(n)}}{s_\alpha^{+}+h_j^{(n)}}\right)\cdot B_m(S)\prod_{\alpha=1}^{m}d\,t_\alpha d\,s_\alpha,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.14}$$

where $\widetilde{\Lambda} = \Lambda_1\big|_{x_1=\dots=x_m=0}$, $s_\alpha^+ = s_\alpha + i\,\varepsilon$, $it_\alpha^+ = it_\alpha + i\,\varepsilon$.

We can write the determinant (5.13) as

$$B_m(S) = \sum_{\omega}(-1)^{\sigma(\omega)} \prod_{\alpha=1}^{m} \frac{1}{s_\alpha - it_{\omega(\alpha)}},$$

where the sum is over all permutations ω of the indices $\{1, \dots, m\}$, and $\sigma(\omega)$ is the parity of a permutation. The rest of the integrand factorizes in a m-fold product. Hence, recalling the definition of F in (2.5), we obtain finally

$$F(z_1, \dots, z_m) = \det\{\widehat{K}_n(z_\alpha, z_\beta)\}, \tag{2.15}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} &\widehat{K}_n(z_\alpha, z_\beta) \\ &\quad = -\frac{n}{2\pi}\int \exp\Big\{-\frac{n}{2}((s_\alpha + \Re z_\alpha)^2 - (it_\beta + \Re z_\beta)^2)\Big\} \prod_{j=1}^{n}\left(\frac{it_\beta^+ + h_j^{(n)}}{s_\alpha^+ + h_j^{(n)}}\right) \frac{d\,t_\beta d\,s_\alpha}{s_\alpha - it_\beta}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.16}$$

Denote

$$\begin{aligned} &\widetilde{K}_n(\lambda, \mu) = \\ &\qquad = -\frac{n}{2\pi^2}\int \frac{d\,t d\,s}{s - it} \exp\Big\{-\frac{n}{2}((s+\lambda)^2 - (it+\mu)^2)\Big\} \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \Im \prod_{j=1}^{n} \frac{it^+ + h_j^{(n)}}{s^+ + h_j^{(n)}} \\ &\quad = -\frac{n}{2\pi^2}\int \frac{d\,t d\,s}{s - it} \exp\Big\{-\frac{n}{2}((s+\lambda)^2 - (it+\mu)^2)\Big\} \prod_{j=1}^{n}(it + h_j^{(n)}) \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \Im \prod_{j=1}^{n} \frac{1}{s^+ + h_j^{(n)}}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.17}$$

Changing variables to $it \to -t$, $s \to -s$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\widetilde{K}_n(\lambda, \mu) \\ &\quad = -\frac{in}{2\pi^2}\int \frac{d\,t d\,s}{s - t} \exp\Big\{-\frac{n}{2}((-s+\lambda)^2 - (-t+\mu)^2)\Big\} \prod_{j=1}^{n}(t - h_j^{(n)}) \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \Im \prod_{j=1}^{n} \frac{1}{s^- - h_j^{(n)}}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.18}$$

where $s^- = s - i\varepsilon$.

Note that we can assume without loss of generality that $\{h_j^{(n)}\}_{j=1}^{n}$ are distinct and then we have on the sense of distributions

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \Im \prod_{j=1}^{n} \frac{1}{s^- - h_j^{(n)}} = \pi \sum_{j=1}^{n} \delta(s - h_j^{(n)}) \prod_{k\neq j} \frac{1}{h_j^{(n)} - h_k^{(n)}}.$$

Hence, the integral in the r.h.s. of (2.18) is

$$-\frac{in}{2\pi}\int d\,t \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\exp\{-\frac{n}{2}((-h_j^{(n)} + \lambda)^2 - (-t+\mu)^2)\}}{h_j^{(n)} - t} \prod_{k=1}^{n}(t - h_k) \prod_{k\neq j} \frac{1}{h_j^{(n)} - h_k^{(n)}}, \tag{2.19}$$

where the integration with respect to t is taken over the imaginary axis.

We will replace now the integral with respect to t to that over L parallel to the imaginary axis and lying to the left of all $\{h_j^{(n)}\}_{j=1}^n$. To do this we consider the rectangle whose vertical sides lie on the imaginary axis and on L, and the horizontal ones lie on the lines $\Re z = \pm R$. The integral (2.19) over this contour is zero, since there are no singularities inside the contour. The integrals over the horizontal segments of the contour tends to zero, as $R \to \infty$, because of the term $-t^2/2$ in the exponent of (2.19). Therefore, the integrals (2.19) over the imaginary axis and L are equal.

Now using the residue theorem for the contour over v, we can get that

$$\widetilde{K}_n(\lambda,\mu) \\ = -n \int\limits_L \frac{d\,t}{2\pi} \oint\limits_C \frac{d\,v}{2\pi} \frac{\exp\left\{-\frac{n}{2}((-v+\lambda)^2 - (-t+\mu)^2)\right\}}{v-t} \prod_{j=1}^n \left(\frac{t-h_j^{(n)}}{v-h_j^{(n)}}\right), \quad (2.20)$$

where the contour C has all $\{h_j^{(n)}\}_{j=1}^n$ inside and does not intersect L.

To finish the proof of Proposition we need

Lemma 2. *Let $\{R_n^{(m)}\}_{m\ge 1}$ be defined in (1.3), $\Im z_1 = \ldots = \Im z_m = -\varepsilon < 0$ and $\Re z_j = \lambda_j$ are distinct. Then*

$$R_m^{(n)}(\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_m) = \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \frac{1}{\pi^m} \mathbf{E}\left\{\prod_{k=1}^m \Im\, Tr \frac{1}{H_n - z_k}\right\}.$$

Proof. Let $\{\lambda_i^{(n)}\}_{i=1}^n$ be the eigenvalues of the matrix H_n. To make the proof more clear, let us consider the cases $m=1$ and $m=2$.

1) $m=1$. Putting in (1.3) $\varphi_1(\lambda) = \Im \dfrac{1}{\lambda - z}$ we have

$$\mathbf{E}\left\{\Im\,\mathrm{Tr}\,\frac{1}{H_n - z}\right\} = \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{E}\left\{\Im \frac{1}{\lambda_j^{(n)} - z}\right\} = \Im \int \frac{R_1^{(n)}(d\,\mu)}{\mu - z}. \quad (2.21)$$

It was proved before that the l.h.s. of (2.21) has a limit, as $\varepsilon \to 0$ (see (2.3),(2.15), (2.17) and (2.20)). Therefore the r.h.s. of (2.21) has a limit too. Hence, according Stieltjes-Perron formula, the measure $R_1^{(n)}(d\,\mu)$ has a density $R_1^{(n)}(\mu)$ and this density is equal to the limit of the l.h.s. of (2.21) , i.e., $\widetilde{K}_n(\mu,\mu)$. Since $\widetilde{K}_n$ is defined by the integral (2.20), $R_1^{(n)}$ is bounded.

2) $m=2$. Putting in (1.3) $\varphi_1(\lambda) = \Im \dfrac{1}{\lambda - z_1} \Im \dfrac{1}{\lambda - z_2}$, $\varphi_2(\lambda_1,\lambda_2) = \Im \dfrac{1}{\lambda_1 - z_1} \Im \dfrac{1}{\lambda_2 - z_2}$ we have

$$\mathbf{E}\left\{\Im\,\mathrm{Tr}\,\frac{1}{H_n - z_1} \Im\,\mathrm{Tr}\,\frac{1}{H_n - z_2}\right\} = \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{E}\left\{\Im \frac{1}{\lambda_j^{(n)} - z_1} \Im \frac{1}{\lambda_j^{(n)} - z_2}\right\} \\ + \sum_{j_1 \ne j_2} \mathbf{E}\left\{\Im \frac{1}{\lambda_{j_1}^{(n)} - z_1} \Im \frac{1}{\lambda_{j_2}^{(n)} - z_2}\right\} = \int R_1^{(n)}(\mu) \Im\left(\frac{1}{\mu - z_1}\right) \Im\left(\frac{1}{\mu - z_2}\right) d\,\mu \quad (2.22) \\ + \int R_2^{(n)}(d\,\mu_1, d\,\mu_2) \Im\left(\frac{1}{\mu_1 - z_1}\right) \Im\left(\frac{1}{\mu_2 - z_2}\right).$$

Consider the limit of the integral

$$I_1 = \int R_1^{(n)}(\mu)\Im\left(\frac{1}{\mu - z_1}\right)\Im\left(\frac{1}{\mu - z_2}\right) d\,\mu$$

where $\Im z_1 = \Im z_2 = -\varepsilon$, $\Re z_1 = \lambda_1$, $\Re z_2 = \lambda_2$ and $\lambda_1 \neq \lambda_2$, as $\varepsilon \to 0$. It is easy to see that

$$I_1 = \int \frac{\varepsilon^2 R_1^{(n)}(\mu) d\,\mu}{((\lambda_1 - \mu)^2 + \varepsilon^2)((\lambda_2 - \mu)^2 + \varepsilon^2)}.$$

Let us make the change $\varepsilon\nu = \lambda_1 - \mu$. We obtain

$$I_1 = -\int \frac{\varepsilon R_1^{(n)}(\lambda_1 - \varepsilon\nu) d\,\nu}{(\nu^2 + 1)((\lambda_2 - \lambda_1 + \varepsilon\nu)^2 + \varepsilon^2)}.$$

$R_1^{(n)}(\lambda_1 - \varepsilon\nu)$ is bounded (as it was proved before), and so,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} I_1 = 0.$$

Now consider the integral

$$I_2 = \int R_2^{(n)}(d\mu_1, d\mu_2)\Im\left(\frac{1}{\mu_1 - z_1}\right)\Im\left(\frac{1}{\mu_2 - z_2}\right).$$

Since we proved that $\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} I_1 = 0$, the limit of I_2, as $\varepsilon \to 0$, is equal to the limit of the l.h.s. of (2.22) (which exists according to (2.3),(2.15), (2.17) and (2.20)). Again by the Stieltjes-Perron formula the measure $R_2^{(n)}(d\,\mu_1, d\,\mu_2)$ has a density $R_2^{(n)}(\mu_1, \mu_2)$, and this density is equal to the limit of the l.h.s, i.e., $\det\{\widetilde{K}_n(\mu_i, \mu_j)\}_{i,j=1}^2$. Since $\widetilde{K}_n$ is defined by the integral (2.20), $R_2^{(n)}$ is bounded.

Therefore,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \frac{1}{\pi^2}\mathbf{E}\left\{\Im \operatorname{Tr} \frac{1}{H_n - z_1} \Im \operatorname{Tr} \frac{1}{H_n - z_2}\right\} = \pi^2 R_2^{(n)}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2).$$

For $m > 2$ the proof is similar (we should use that $R_1^{(n)}, \ldots, R_{m-1}^{(n)}$ are bounded). ☐

Now (2.15), (2.16), and Lemma 2 yield formula (2.1) for the correlation function (1.3), where $\widetilde{K}_n$ is defined by (2.20). The multiplier $\exp\{\mu^2 - \lambda^2\}$ vanishes during the calculation of the determinant, and so we can omit it. Finally we have formula (2.2). ☐

3 Proof of the Theorem 1.

In this section we will prove Theorem 1, using (2.1) and making the limiting transition in (2.2). Putting in formula (2.2) $\lambda = \lambda_0 + \lambda'/n$ and $\mu = \lambda_0 + \mu'/n$, we get:

$$K_n(\lambda, \mu) = -n \int_L \frac{dt}{2\pi} \oint_C \frac{dv}{2\pi} \exp\{v\lambda' - t\mu'\} \frac{\exp\{n(S_n(t, \lambda_0) - S_n(v, \lambda_0))\}}{v - t}, \tag{3.1}$$

where

$$S_n(z, \lambda_0) = \frac{z^2}{2} + \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \ln(z - h_j^{(n)}) - \lambda_0 z, \tag{3.2}$$

and C is an arbitrary contour having all $\{h_j^{(n)}\}_{j=1}^n$ inside, L is a line parallel to the imaginary axis and lying to the left of C. Formula (2.1) reduces (1.6) to the proof of the following relation:

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n\rho_n(\lambda_0)}K_n(\lambda,\mu)=S(\lambda'-\mu'),$$

where S is defined in (1.7).

We will choose now the contour C as follows. Define

$$g_n^{(0)}(z)=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\frac{1}{h_j^{(n)}-z}, \tag{3.3}$$

and consider the equation

$$z-g_n^{(0)}(z)=\lambda. \tag{3.4}$$

Equation (3.4) can be written as a polynomial equation of degree $(n+1)$ and so it has $(n+1)$ roots. Considering the real z and taking into account that if $z\to h_j^{(n)}+0$, then the l.h.s. tends to $+\infty$, and if $z\to h_j^{(n)}-0$ then the l.h.s. tends to $-\infty$, we have that $n-1$ of these roots are always real and belong to the segments between $h_j^{(n)}$. If λ is big enough, then all $n+1$ roots are real. Let $z_n(\lambda)$ be a root which has the order $\lambda-1/\lambda+O(1/\lambda^2)$, as $\lambda\to\infty$. If λ decreases, then $z_n(\lambda)$ will decrease too, and coming to some λ_{c_1} the real root disappears and there appear two complex ones – $z_n(\lambda)$ and $\overline{z_n(\lambda)}$. Then $z_n(\lambda)$ may be real again, than again complex, and so on, however as soon as λ becomes less then some λ_{c_2}, the root becomes again real. Choose C_n to be the union of two curves – $z_n(\lambda)$ and $\overline{z_n(\lambda)}$, corresponding to λ such that $\Im z_n(\lambda)\neq 0$. It is clear that the set of such λ is $\bigcup_{j=1}^{k} I_k$, where $\{I_j\}_{j=1}^k$ are non intersecting segments. It is easy to see also that the contour C_n is closed and has all $\{h_j^{(n)}\}_{j=1}^n$ inside.

Let us consider the limiting equation

$$z-g^{(0)}(z)=\lambda, \text{where} \quad g^{(0)}(z)=\int\frac{N^{(0)}(d\lambda)}{\lambda-z}, \tag{3.5}$$

where $\lambda\in\mathbb{R}$ is fixed. We have

Lemma 3. *Equation (3.5) has a unique solution in the upper half-plane $\Im z>0$, if $\lambda\in\operatorname{supp}N$, and has no solutions, if $\lambda\notin\operatorname{supp}N$. The solution is continuous in λ in the domain where it exists.*

Proof. Set

$$g(z)=\int\frac{N(d\lambda)}{\lambda-z}.$$

Then we have [4]

$$g(z)=g^{(0)}(z+g(z)). \tag{3.6}$$

Note, that the measure N is absolutely continuous. Indeed, it follows from (3.6) that

$$|\Im g|\le\int\frac{|\Im z+\Im g|N^{(0)}(d\,\lambda)}{(\lambda-\Re z-\Re g)^2+(\Im z+\Im g)^2}\le\frac{1}{|\Im g+\Im z|}=\frac{1}{|\Im g|+|\Im z|},$$

thus

$$|\Im g|\le 1.$$

According to the standard theory, it means that there exists $\lim_{\varepsilon\to+0}\Im g(\lambda+i\varepsilon)$ and so the measure N is absolutely continuous.

Put $z(\lambda)=\lambda+i\,0+g(\lambda+i\,0)$, if $\lambda\in\operatorname{supp}N$. Using (3.6), we obtain that

$$z(\lambda)-g^{(0)}(z(\lambda))=\lambda.$$

Hence, the solution exists if $\lambda\in\operatorname{supp}N$. It is easy to see that the contour C_∞ constructed by the union of the curves $z(\lambda)$ and $\overline{z(\lambda)}$, intersects the real axis at the points where $1-\frac{d}{d\,x}g^{(0)}(x)\geq 0$.

Let us prove the uniqueness of the solution. Let $z=x+iy$ be a solution of (3.5), $y>0$. Then, considering the imaginary part (3.5), we obtain

$$\int\frac{N^{(0)}(d\lambda)}{(x-\lambda)^2+y^2}=1. \tag{3.7}$$

If x is real and outside C_∞, then $1-\frac{d}{d\,x}g^{(0)}(x)>0$, hence

$$1-\int\frac{N^{(0)}(d\lambda)}{(x-\lambda)^2}>0,$$

thus

$$\int\frac{N^{(0)}(d\lambda)}{(x-\lambda)^2+y^2}<\int\frac{N^{(0)}(d\lambda)}{(x-\lambda)^2}<1,$$

and there are no solutions. If x is inside C_∞, then the solution with respect to y is unique (since the r.h.s of (3.7) is monotone in y) and this solution is found already, it is $z(\lambda)$. For this solution $z-g^{(0)}(z)$ belongs to $\operatorname{supp}N$. So, we are left to prove the continuity of $z(\lambda)$. Let $\lambda_0\in\operatorname{supp}N$. Consider $F(z)=z-g^{(0)}(z)-\lambda_0$ and $f_\lambda(z)=\lambda_0-\lambda$. It was proved before that $F(z)$ has a unique root $z(\lambda_0)$ in the upper half-plane. Denote $\omega=\{z:|z-z(\lambda_0)|=\varepsilon\}$. There exists $\delta>0$ such that $|F(z)|>\delta$. Therefore, if $\lambda\in U_\delta(\lambda)$ and $z\in\omega$ we have

$$|F(z)|>\delta>|f(z)|.$$

It follows from the Rouchet theorem that for any $\lambda\in U_\delta(\lambda)$ the function $F(z)+f(z)=z-g^{(0)}(z)-\lambda$ has the same number of roots as $F(z)$ inside ω, i.e., one. This proves the continuity of $z(\lambda)$. The lemma is proved. □

Let us study the behavior of the function $\Re S_n(z_n(\lambda),\lambda_0)$ of (3.2) on the contour C_n.

Lemma 4. *Let z belong to the upper part of C_n, i.e., $z=z_n(\lambda)=x_n(\lambda)+iy_n(\lambda)$, $y_n(\lambda)>0$, $\lambda\in\bigcup_{j=1}^{k}I_j$, where*

$$z_n(\lambda)-g_n^{(0)}(z_n(\lambda))=\lambda. \tag{3.8}$$

Then $\Re\,S_n(z_n(\lambda),\lambda_0)\geq 0$, and the equality holds only at $\lambda=\lambda_0$.

Proof. The real and the imaginary parts of (3.8) yield for $x_n=\Re z_n$ and $y_n=\Im z_n$:

$$\left\{\begin{array}{cc} x_n(\lambda)+\dfrac{1}{n}\displaystyle\sum_{j=1}^{n}\frac{x_n(\lambda)-h_j^{(n)}}{(x_n(\lambda)-h_j^{(n)})^2+y_n^2(\lambda)} & =\lambda, \\ y_n(\lambda)\left(1-\dfrac{1}{n}\displaystyle\sum_{j=1}^{n}\frac{1}{(x_n(\lambda)-h_j^{(n)})^2+y_n^2(\lambda)}\right) & =0, \end{array}\right. \tag{3.9}$$

Differentiate (3.8) with respect to λ:

$$z_n'(\lambda)\left(1-\frac{d}{d\,z}g_n^{(0)}(z_n(\lambda))\right)=1, \text{ i.e.,}$$

$$z_n'(\lambda)=\left(1-\frac{d}{d\,z}g_n^{(0)}(z_n(\lambda))\right)^{-1}, \tag{3.10}$$

where $g_n^{(0)}(z)$ is defined in (3.3).

It follows from the implicit function theorem that C_n intersects the real axis at the points where

$$1-\frac{d}{d\,x}g_n^{(0)}(x)=0.$$

Since

$$\frac{d}{d\,x}g_n^{(0)}(x)=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\frac{1}{(x-h_j^{(n)})^2},$$

the inequality $1-\frac{d}{d\,x}g_n^{(0)}(x)<0$ holds near $h_j^{(n)}$. Thus, the function $1-\frac{d}{d\,x}g_n^{(0)}(x)$ is always positive outside C_n. On the other hand, $z_n(\lambda)=x_n(\lambda)$ outside C_n and in this case

$$x_n'(\lambda)=z_n'(\lambda)=\left(1-\frac{d}{d\,z}g_n^{(0)}(z_n(\lambda))\right)^{-1}>0.$$

Now let $\lambda\in\bigcup\limits_{j=1}^{k}I_j$, i.e., $z_n(\lambda)$ belongs to C_n. We get from (3.10)

$$\Re z_n'(\lambda)=x_n'(\lambda)=\Re\left(\left(1-\frac{d}{d\,z}g_n^{(0)}(z_n(\lambda))\right)^{-1}\right)=\frac{a_n(\lambda)}{a_n^2(\lambda)+b_n^2(\lambda)},$$

where

$$\begin{cases} a_n(\lambda) &=\Re\left(1-\frac{d}{d\,z}g_n^{(0)}(z_n(\lambda))\right),\\ b_n(\lambda) &=\Im\left(1-\frac{d}{d\,z}g_n^{(0)}(z_n(\lambda))\right),\end{cases} \tag{3.11}$$

and hence

$$a_n(\lambda)=1-\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\frac{(x_n(\lambda)-h_j^{(n)})^2-y_n^2(\lambda)}{((x_n(\lambda)-h_j^{(n)})^2+y_n^2(\lambda))^2}.$$

Taking into account that $y_n(\lambda)\neq 0$, we obtain from (3.9) that

$$1=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\frac{1}{(x_n(\lambda)-h_j^{(n)})^2+y_n^2(\lambda)}. \tag{3.12}$$

This and the previous equation yield

$$a_n(\lambda)=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\frac{2y_n^2(\lambda)}{((x_n(\lambda)-h_j^{(n)})^2+y_n^2(\lambda))^2}>0. \tag{3.13}$$

It follows from (3.11) and (3.13) that in this case $x_n'(\lambda) > 0$ too (if only $y_n(\lambda) \neq 0$). Hence, $x_n(\lambda)$ is a monotone increasing function defined everywhere in $\mathbb{R}$.

Consider $\Re S_n(z, \lambda_0)$ on the upper part of C_n. Substituting the expression $z_n(\lambda) = x_n(\lambda) + iy_n(\lambda)$ into (3.2), $y_n(\lambda) > 0$, we obtain

$$\Re S_n(z_n(\lambda), \lambda_0) = \frac{x_n^2(\lambda) - y_n^2(\lambda)}{2} + \frac{1}{n}\Re\sum_{j=1}^{n} \ln(x_n(\lambda) + iy_n(\lambda) - h_j^{(n)}) - \lambda_0 x_n(\lambda) + C.$$

Differentiating this equality and using (3.12), we get

$$\Re S_n(z_n(\lambda), \lambda_0)' = x_n'(\lambda)(\lambda - \lambda_0). \tag{3.14}$$

Since $x_n'(\lambda) > 0$, the function $\Re S_n(z, \lambda_0)$ has a minimum at $\lambda = \lambda_0$, and since $\Re S_n(z_n(\lambda_0), \lambda_0) = 0$, $\Re S_n(z_n(\lambda), \lambda_0) \geq 0$ and the equality holds only at $\lambda = \lambda_0$.

Note that the lower part of C_n differs from the upper one only by the sign of $y_n(\lambda)$, hence $\Re S_n(z, \lambda_0) \geq 0$, $z \in C_n$ and the equality holds only at $z = z(\lambda_0)$ and $z = \overline{z(\lambda_0)}$. ☐

We will prove a similar fact about the behavior of $\Re S_n(z, \lambda_0)$ along the line L_n : $\zeta_n(y) = x_n(\lambda_0) + i\, y$.

Lemma 5. *Consider the part of L_n, lying in the upper half-plane $y > 0$. On this part $\Re S_n(z, \lambda_0) = \Re S_n(\zeta_n(y), \lambda_0) \leq 0$ and the equality holds only at $y = y_n(\lambda_0)$.*

Proof. The function $\Re S_n(z, \lambda_0)$ is on L_n

$$\Re S_n(\zeta_n(y), \lambda_0) = \frac{x_n^2(\lambda_0) - y^2}{2} + \frac{1}{n}\Re\sum_{j=1}^{n} \ln(x_n(\lambda_0) + iy - h_j^{(n)}) - \lambda_0 x_n(\lambda_0) + C.$$

Differentiating this with respect to y, we obtain

$$\Re S_n(\zeta_n(y), \lambda_0)' = y\left(-1 + \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{1}{(x_n(\lambda_0) - h_j^{(n)})^2 + y^2}\right). \tag{3.15}$$

Taking into account that the function $\sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{1}{(x_n(\lambda_0) - h_j)^2 + y^2}$ is monotone in y, we have from (3.12) that $y = y_n(\lambda_0)$ is a maximum point of $\Re S_n(\zeta_n(y), \lambda_0)$. Similarly for $y < 0$ the maximum point is $y = -y_n(\lambda_0)$. Therefore, $\Re S_n(z, \lambda_0) \leq 0$ on L_n and the equality holds only at $z = z(\lambda_0)$ or $z = \overline{z(\lambda_0)}$. ☐

Thus, we have proved that

$$\Re(n(S_n(t, \lambda_0) - S_n(v, \lambda_0))) \leq 0, \tag{3.16}$$

and the equality holds only if v and t are both equal to $z(\lambda_0)$ or $\overline{z(\lambda_0)}$.

We need below also the second derivative of $\Re S_n(z, \lambda_0)$. Assume that $\lambda \in U_\delta(\lambda_0)$, where $U_\delta(\lambda_0)$ is an interval $(\lambda_0 - \delta, \lambda_0 + \delta)$. We get from (3.14)

$$\Re(-S_n(z_n(\lambda), \lambda_0))'' = -x_n'(\lambda) + x_n''(\lambda)(\lambda_0 - \lambda). \tag{3.17}$$

Lemma 6. *There exist n-independent $c > 0$ and $\delta > 0$ such that $\Re(-S_n(z_n(\lambda), \lambda_0))'' < -c$ for any $\lambda \in U_\delta(\lambda_0)$.*

Proof. To prove the lemma it is sufficient to show that $x''_n(\lambda)$ is bounded uniformly in n and that $x'_n(\lambda)$ is bounded from below by a positive constant uniformly in n in some small enough neighborhood $U_\delta(\lambda_0)$ of λ_0. Thus, we will show that $x'_n(\lambda) \ge C$ for all $\lambda \in U_\delta(\lambda_0)$.

We have from (3.10)

$$\Re z'_n(\lambda) = x'_n(\lambda) = \Re\left(\left(1 - \frac{d}{d\,z} g_n^{(0)}(z_n(\lambda))\right)^{-1}\right) = \frac{a_n(\lambda)}{a_n^2(\lambda) + b_n^2(\lambda)},$$

where a_n, b_n are defined in (3.11). Note that

$$|b_n(\lambda)| = \left|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{2y_n(\lambda)(x_n(\lambda) - h_j^{(n)})}{((x_n(\lambda) - h_j^{(n)})^2 + y_n^2(\lambda))^2}\right| \le \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{2|y_n(\lambda)||(x_n(\lambda) - h_j^{(n)})|}{((x_n(\lambda) - h_j^{(n)})^2 + y_n^2(\lambda))^2} \le$$

$$\le \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{1}{(x_n(\lambda) - h_j^{(n)})^2 + y_n^2(\lambda)} = 1.$$

Hence

$$x'_n(\lambda) \ge \frac{a_n(\lambda)}{a_n^2(\lambda) + 1}. \tag{3.18}$$

Use now the following fact, which will be proved after the proof of Lemma 6:

Lemma 7. *There exist n-independent C_1 and C_2 such that*

$$|x_n(\lambda)| < C_1, \quad |y_n(\lambda)| < C_1, \quad |y_n(\lambda)| > C_2, \quad |x''_n(\lambda)| < C_1, \tag{3.19}$$

for all $\lambda \in U_\delta(\lambda_0)$, where n-independent δ small enough. Moreover,

$$0 < c_1 < a_n(\lambda) < c_2, \ \lambda \in U_\delta(\lambda_0), \tag{3.20}$$

for some n-independent c_1 and c_2.

This lemma and (3.18) yield that $x'_n(\lambda) \ge C$ for all $\lambda \in U_\delta(\lambda_0)$ and since x''_n is bounded uniformly, the second terms in (3.17) is of order δ. Lemma 6 is proved. □

Proof of Lemma 7. We use Lemma 3. Consider the solution $z(\lambda)$ of the limiting equation (3.5). Since $\lambda_0 \in \operatorname{supp} N$, $\Im z(\lambda_0) = A > 0$. Taking into account the continuity of $z(\lambda)$, we can take a sufficiently small neighborhood $U_{\delta_1}(\lambda_0)$ such that for $\lambda \in U_{\delta_1}(\lambda_0)$

$$|z(\lambda) - z(\lambda_0)| < \varepsilon/2. \tag{3.21}$$

Note that we can choose λ_0-independent δ_1, since $z(\lambda)$ is uniformly continuous.

Consider the set of the functions $f_\lambda(z) = -g^{(0)}(z) + z - \lambda$ and the function $\phi(z) = -g_n^{(0)}(z) + g^{(0)}(z)$, where $g^{(0)}$, $g_n^{(0)}$ are defined in (3.5),(3.3), and set $\omega = \{z : |z - z(\lambda_0)| \le \varepsilon\}$. Let us show that for any $\lambda \in U_{\delta_1}(\lambda_0)$ and $z \in \partial\omega$

$$|f_\lambda(z)| > c_0, \tag{3.22}$$

where c_0 does not depend on λ. Assume the opposite and choose a sequence $\{\lambda_k\}_{k\ge1}$,$\lambda_k \in U_{\delta_1}(\lambda_0)$ such that $|f_{\lambda_k}(z_k)| \to 0$, as $k \to \infty$. There exists a subsequence $\{\lambda_{k_m}\}$, converging to some $\lambda \in U_{\delta_1}(\lambda_0)$ such that the subsequence $\{z_{k_m}\}$ converges to $z \in \partial\omega$. For these λ and z $f_\lambda(z) = 0$. But equation $f_\lambda(z) = 0$ has in the upper half-plane only one root

$z(\lambda)$, which is inside of the circle of the radius $\varepsilon/2$ and with the center $z(\lambda_0)$. This contradiction proves (3.22). Since $g_n^{(0)}(z) \to g^{(0)}(z)$ uniformly on any compact set of the upper half-plane (recall weak convergence $N_n^{(h)} \to N^{(h)}$), we have starting from some n

$$|\phi(z)| < c_0, \; z \in \partial\omega \tag{3.23}$$

Comparing (3.22) and (3.23), we obtain that starting from some n

$$|f_\lambda(z)| > |\phi(z)|, \; z \in \partial\omega, \; \forall \lambda \in U_{\delta_1}(\lambda_0).$$

Since both functions are analytic, the Rouchet theorem implies that $f_\lambda(z)$ and $f_\lambda(z) + \phi(z) = z - g_n^{(0)}(z) - \lambda$ have the same number of zeros in ω. Since $f_\lambda(z)$ has only one zero in ω, we conclude that $z_n(\lambda)$ belongs to ω, $x_n(\lambda)$ and $y_n(\lambda)$ are bounded and $y_n(\lambda) > C > 0$ uniformly in n if $\lambda \in U_\delta(\lambda_0)$, where δ one can take equal to δ_1. Since $z_n(\lambda)$ is analytic, we proved also that $x_n''(\lambda)$ is bounded uniformly in n if $\lambda \in U_\delta(\lambda_0)$.

Note that we have proved also that for any λ_0 such that $\rho(\lambda_0) > 0$ and for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists δ such that for any $\lambda \in U_\delta(\lambda_0)$ and any $n > N(\delta, \varepsilon)$

$$|z_n(\lambda) - z(\lambda)| \le 2\varepsilon.$$

Observe also that we can take an interval $(a, b) \subset \operatorname{supp} N$ such that $\lambda_0 \in (a, b)$ and for all $\lambda \in (a, b)$ $\rho(\lambda) = \pi \Im g(\lambda + i \cdot 0) = \Im z(\lambda) > 0$. Thus, we proved that $z_n(\lambda) \to z(\lambda)$, $n \to \infty$ uniformly in $\lambda \in (a, b)$.

Since $g_n^{(0)}$ is analytic, $\frac{d}{d\,z} g_n^{(0)} \to \frac{d}{d\,z} g^{(0)}$ also uniformly on any compact set of the upper half-plane. Recall that $a_n(\lambda) = \Re\left(1 - \frac{d}{d\,z} g_n^{(0)}(z_n(\lambda))\right)$. Since $z_n(\lambda) \in \omega$ if $\lambda \in U_\delta(\lambda_0)$, it suffices to prove (3.20) for

$$\Re\left(1 - \frac{d}{d\,z} g^{(0)}(z_n(\lambda))\right) = \int \frac{2y_n^2(\lambda) N^{(0)}(d\,h)}{((x_n(\lambda) - h)^2 + y_n^2(\lambda))^2}.$$

But if for $\lambda \in U_\delta(\lambda_0)$ $x_n(\lambda)$ and $y_n(\lambda)$ are bounded, $y_n(\lambda) > C > 0$ uniformly in n, and $\operatorname{supp} N^{(0)}$ is bounded, the r.h.s. here is bounded from both sides by some positive constants. □

According to Lemma 6 and by the hypothesis of the Theorem 1

$$\Re\left(-S_n(z_n(\lambda), \lambda_0)\right) < -c\frac{(\lambda - \lambda_0)^2}{2}, \; \lambda \in U_\delta(\lambda_0). \tag{3.24}$$

Since $\frac{d}{d\,\lambda} \Re(S_n(z_n(\lambda), \lambda_0))$ has the unique root $\lambda = \lambda_0$, the function $\Re\left(S_n(z_n(\lambda), \lambda_0)\right)$ is monotone for $\lambda \neq \lambda_0$ and we have outside of $U_\delta(\lambda_0)$

$$\Re(-S_n(z_n(\lambda), \lambda_0)) < -c\frac{\delta^2}{2}. \tag{3.25}$$

Apply analogous argument to the neighborhood of $z_n(\lambda_0)$ on L_n. We have from (3.15)

$$\begin{aligned}\Re(S_n(z_n(y),\lambda_0))'' &= -1+\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\frac{1}{(x_n(\lambda_0)-h_j^{(n)})^2+y^2}-\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\frac{2y^2}{((x_n(\lambda_0)-h_j^{(n)})^2+y^2)^2}\\ &= \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\frac{y_n^2(\lambda_0)-y^2}{((x_n(\lambda_0)-h_j^{(n)})^2+y^2)\cdot((x_n(\lambda_0)-h_j^{(n)})^2+y_n^2(\lambda_0))}\\ &\qquad -\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\frac{2y^2}{((x_n(\lambda_0)-h_j^{(n)})^2+y^2)^2}\end{aligned} \tag{3.26}$$

Consider $y\in U_{\delta/2}(y(\lambda_0))$ $(y(\lambda_0)>0)$ and recall that $y_n(\lambda_0)\in U_{\delta/2}(y(\lambda_0))$ starting from some n. Hence, if n big enough

$$|y_n(\lambda)-y|<\delta.$$

This and (3.26) yield

$$\Re(S_n(\zeta_n(y),\lambda_0))''<-c,\ \text{ if } y\in U_{\delta/2}(y(\lambda_0)),$$

hence,

$$\Re(S_n(\zeta_n(y),\lambda_0))<-c\frac{(y-y_n(\lambda_0))^2}{2}. \tag{3.27}$$

Since $\dfrac{d}{d\,y}\Re(S_n(\zeta_n(y),\lambda_0))$ has the unique root $y=y_n(\lambda_0)$, the function $\Re(S_n(\zeta_n(y),\lambda_0))$ is monotone for $y\neq y_n(\lambda_0)$ and we have outside of $U_{\delta/2}(y(\lambda_0))$

$$\Re(S_n(\zeta_n(y),\lambda_0))<-c\frac{\delta^2}{2}. \tag{3.28}$$

Besides, since $\dfrac{d^2}{d\,y^2}\Re(S_n(\zeta_n(y),\lambda_0))\to-1$, as $y\to\infty$, uniformly in n, $\Re(S_n(\zeta_n(y),\lambda_0))$ is convex. Hence we get for some fixed segment $[-K;K]$ (we can take n-independent K, taking into account that $z_n(\lambda_0)$ is in some neighborhood of $z(\lambda_0)$)

$$\Re(S_n(\zeta_n(y),\lambda_0))<-c_1|y|+c_2,\ c_1>0. \tag{3.29}$$

Denote $U_1=U_\delta(\lambda_0)$, $U_2=U_\delta(y(\lambda_0))$. Using formulas (3.24),(3.25), (3.27) and (3.28), we obtain for sufficiently big n

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|\int\limits_{L_n}\frac{dt}{2\pi}\oint\limits_{C_n}\frac{dv}{2\pi}\exp\{v\mu'-t\lambda'\}\frac{\exp\{n(S_n(t,\lambda_0)-S_n(v,\lambda_0))\}}{v-t}\right|\\ &\le C\left(\int\limits_{U_2}\int\limits_{U_1}+\int\limits_{U_2}\oint\limits_{C_n\setminus U_1}+\int\limits_{L_n\setminus U_2}\int\limits_{U_1}\right)\frac{\exp\{\Re(n(S_n(\zeta_n(y),\lambda_0)-S_n(z_n(\lambda),\lambda_0)))\}|z_n'|d\,\lambda\,d\,y}{|z_n(\lambda)-\zeta_n(y)|}\\ &\le C\int\limits_{U_2}\int\limits_{U_1}\frac{|z_n'(\lambda)|d\,\lambda dy}{|z_n(\lambda)-\zeta_n(y)|}+C_1\cdot|C_n|\cdot\exp\{-c\frac{n\delta^2}{2}\}+C_2\cdot\exp\{-c\frac{(n-1)\delta^2}{2}\},\end{aligned} \tag{3.30}$$

where $|C_n|$ is the length of the contour C_n. Note that

$$\int\limits_{U_2}\int\limits_{U_1} \frac{|z_n'(\lambda)|d\,\lambda dy}{|z_n(\lambda)-\zeta_n(y)|} \le \int\limits_{U_2}\int\limits_{U_1} \frac{|z_n'(\lambda)|d\,\lambda dy}{\sqrt{(1-\cos\alpha_n+o(\delta))(|z_n(\lambda)|^2+|\zeta_n(y)|^2)}},$$

where α_n is the angle between C_n and L_n at the point $z(\lambda_0)$, i.e., $\cot\alpha_n = \dfrac{y_n'(\lambda_0)}{x_n'(\lambda_0)}$. Since $x_n'(\lambda_0) > c > 0$, $\cos\alpha_n < 1-\varepsilon$, we have

$$\int\limits_{U_2}\int\limits_{U_1} \frac{|z_n'(\lambda)|d\,\lambda dy}{\sqrt{(1-\cos\alpha_n+o(\delta))(|z_n(\lambda)|^2+|\zeta_n(y)|^2)}} \le C_0 \int\limits_{U_2}\int\limits_{U_1} \frac{|z_n'(\lambda)|d\,\lambda dy}{\sqrt{|z_n(\lambda)|^2+|\zeta_n(y)|^2}} \le C\cdot 4\delta. \tag{3.31}$$

Now we need the following

Lemma 8. *The length $|C_n|$ of the contour C_n admits the bound:*

$$|C_n| \le Cn.$$

Proof. We will find the bound for the length of the part of C_n between the lines $x = x_1$ and $x = x_2$, $x_2 - x_1 = 2$. Denote

$$\begin{gathered} y^2(x) = s(x), \quad x - h_j^{(n)} = \triangle_j, \\ \sigma_k = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{1}{(\triangle_j^2+s)^k}, \quad \sigma_{kl} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\triangle_j^l}{(\triangle_j^2+s)^k}\ \ k=\overline{1,3},\ l=1,2. \end{gathered} \tag{3.32}$$

Differentiating (3.12) with respect to x, we obtain the equality

$$-s'\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{1}{(\triangle_j^2+s)^2} - \frac{2}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\triangle_j}{(\triangle_j^2+s)^2} = 0,$$

implying that

$$|s'| = 2|\sigma_{21}|\sigma_2^{-1} \le 2\sigma_{22}^{1/2}\sigma_2^{-1/2} \le 2\sigma_2^{-1/2} \le 2\sigma_1^{-1/2} = 2. \tag{3.33}$$

Differentiating (3.12) with respect to x twice, we have

$$\begin{aligned} s''\cdot\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{1}{(\triangle_j^2+s)^2}\right) &- 2(s')^2\cdot\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{1}{(\triangle_j^2+s)^3}\right) \\ &- 8s'\cdot\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\triangle_j}{(\triangle_j^2+s)^3}\right) + \frac{2}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{(\triangle_j^2+s)^2 - 4\triangle_j^2(\triangle_j^2+s)}{(\triangle_j^2+s)^4} = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{3.34}$$

or, in our notations

$$s''\sigma_2 - 2(s')^2\sigma_3 - 8s'\sigma_{31} + 2(4s\sigma_3 - 3\sigma_2) = 0. \tag{3.35}$$

Note that

$$s\sigma_3 = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{s}{(\triangle_j^2+s)^3} \le \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{1}{(\triangle_j^2+s)^2} = \sigma_2,$$

and also

$$\sigma_{31}^2=\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\frac{\triangle_j}{(\triangle_j^2+s)^3}\right)^2\le\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\frac{\triangle_j^2}{(\triangle_j^2+s)^3}\cdot\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\frac{1}{(\triangle_j^2+s)^3}\le\sigma_2\sigma_3.$$

Using this inequality, we get from (3.35)

$$\begin{gathered}s''\sigma_2=2(s')^2\sigma_3+8s'\sigma_{31}-2(4s\sigma_3-3\sigma_2)=2\sigma_3\left(s'+2\sigma_{31}/\sigma_3\right)^2-8\sigma_{31}^2/\sigma_3\\ -8s\sigma_3+6\sigma_2\ge-8\sigma_{31}^2/\sigma_3-2\sigma_2\ge-10\sigma_2,\end{gathered}$$

or

$$s''\ge-10. \tag{3.36}$$

Let $x_*\in[x_1;x_2]$ be the maximum point of $y(x)$, and $y'(x)=\frac{s'(x)}{2\sqrt{s(x)}}>0$ when $x\in[x_0,x_*]$ and let $l(x)$ be the length of C_n between x_1 and $x\in[x_1;x_2]$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}l(x_*)-l(x_0)&=\int_{x_0}^{x_*}\sqrt{1+(y'(x))^2}d\,x=\int_{x_0}^{x_*}\sqrt{1+\left(\frac{s'(x)}{2\sqrt{s(x)}}\right)^2}d\,x\\ &\le\int_{x_0}^{x_*}\left(1+\frac{s'(x)}{2\sqrt{s(x)}}\right)d\,x=(x_*-x_0)+\sqrt{s_*}-\sqrt{s_0}\le(x_*-x_0)+\sqrt{s_*-s_0},\end{aligned}\tag{3.37}$$

where $s_*=s(x_*)$, $s_0=s(x_0)$. Taking into account that $s'(x_*)=0$, we write

$$s_0-s_*=\frac{s''(\xi)(x_0-x_*)^2}{2},$$

where $\xi\in[x_0,x_*]$. This and (3.36) imply

$$0\le s_*-s_0\le5(x_0-x_*)^2.$$

Hence, we get in view of (3.37)

$$l(x_*)-l(x_0)\le(1+\sqrt{5})(x_*-x_0). \tag{3.38}$$

We have similar inequality for $x_0>x_*$ and $y'(x)<0$, $x\in[x_*,x_0]$. Take an arbitrary $x_0\in[x_1;x_2]$ and denote x_* the nearest to x_0 maximum point of $y(x)$ in $[x_1,x_0]$. Then, splitting $[x_1,x_*]$ in the segments of monotonicity of y and using (3.33), (3.38), and its analog for decreasing $y(x)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}l(x_0)=l(x_*)+\int_{x_*}^{x_0}l'(x)d\,x&\le(1+\sqrt{5})(x_*-x_1)+\int_{x_*}^{x_0}\left(1+\frac{|s'(x)|}{2\sqrt{s(x)}}\right)d\,x\\ &\le(1+\sqrt{5})(x_*-x_1)+(x_0-x_*)+\sqrt{|s_0-s_*|}\\ &\le(1+\sqrt{5})(x_*-x_1)+(x_0-x_*)+\sqrt{2}\sqrt{x_0-x_*}\le C\sqrt{x_0-x_1},\end{aligned}\tag{3.39}$$

where the last inequality holds, because $|x_0-x_*|\le|x_0-x_1|$ and $|x_0-x_1|\le2$. Hence,

$$l(x_2)\le C\sqrt{x_2-x_1}\le C.$$

It follows from (3.12) that $\mathrm{dist}(x_n(\lambda),\{h_j^{(n)}\}_{j=1}^n)\le1$. Therefore, we can cover C_n by the n stripes of the width 2 and thus we obtain that $|C_n|\le Cn$. $\square$

Using Lemma 8, (3.31) and (3.30) we get that

$$\lim_{\delta\to 0}\int_{L_n}\frac{dt}{2\pi}\oint_{C_n}\frac{dv}{2\pi}\exp\{v\mu'-t\lambda'\}\frac{\exp\{n(S_n(t,\lambda_0)-S_n(v,\lambda_0))\}}{v-t}=0. \tag{3.40}$$

Recall that

$$K_n(\lambda,\mu)=-n\int_{L}\frac{dt}{2\pi}\oint_{C_n}\frac{dv}{2\pi}\exp\{v\lambda'-t\mu'\}\frac{\exp\{n(S_n(t,\lambda_0)-S_n(v,\lambda_0))\}}{v-t}.$$

Change the order of the integrations and move the integration over t from L to L_n. To this end consider the contour $C_{R,\varepsilon}$ of Fig.1, where R is big enough

It is clear that the integral with respect to t over this contour is equal to the residue at $v=t$ for any v between L and L_n:

$$\int_{C_{R,\varepsilon}}\frac{dt}{2\pi}\exp\{v\lambda'-t\mu'\}\frac{\exp\{n(S_n(t,\lambda_0)-S_n(v,\lambda_0))\}}{v-t}=i\cdot\exp\{v(\mu'-\lambda')\}.$$

If v does not lie between L and L_n, then we can find δ such that v is inside of the contour $C_{R,\varepsilon}$ for any $\varepsilon<\delta$. Therefore, we have for sufficiently big R and for $\varepsilon\to 0$

$$\begin{aligned}&\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\oint_{C_n}\frac{dv}{2\pi}\int_{C_{R,\varepsilon}}\frac{dt}{2\pi}\exp\{v\lambda'-t\mu'\}\frac{\exp\{n(S_n(t,\lambda_0)-S_n(v,\lambda_0))\}}{v-t}\\&=-\frac{i}{2\pi}\int_{\overline{z_n(\lambda_0)}}^{z_n(\lambda_0)}\exp\{v(\lambda'-\mu')\}dv=\exp\{x_n(\lambda_0)(\lambda'-\mu')\}\frac{\sin(y_n(\lambda_0)(\lambda'-\mu'))}{\pi(\lambda'-\mu')}.\end{aligned}$$

Integrals over the lines $\Im z=\pm R$ have the order $C\,e^{-nR^2/2}$, and we get for $R\to\infty$

$$\begin{aligned}&\oint_{C_n}\frac{dv}{2\pi}\oint_{L\bigcup L_n}\frac{dt}{2\pi}\exp\{v\lambda'-t\mu'\}\frac{\exp\{n(S_n(t,\lambda_0)-S_n(v,\lambda_0))\}}{v-t}\\&\qquad=\exp\{x_n(\lambda_0)(\lambda'-\mu')\}\frac{\sin(y_n(\lambda_0)(\lambda'-\mu'))}{\pi(\lambda'-\mu')}.\end{aligned} \tag{3.41}$$

Thus, adding (3.41) and (3.30), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{n}K_n(\lambda,\mu) &= -\int\limits_{L}\frac{dt}{2\pi}\oint\limits_{C_n}\frac{dv}{2\pi}\exp\{v\lambda'-t\mu'\}\frac{\exp\{n(S_n(t,\lambda_0)-S_n(v,\lambda_0))\}}{v-t}\\
&= -\left(\int\limits_{L_n}\frac{dt}{2\pi}\oint\limits_{C_n}\frac{dv}{2\pi}+\oint\limits_{L\cup L_n}\frac{dt}{2\pi}\oint\limits_{C_n}\frac{dv}{2\pi}\right)\exp\{v\lambda'-t\mu'\}\frac{\exp\{n(S_n(t,\lambda_0)-S_n(v,\lambda_0))\}}{v-t}\\
&= -\int\limits_{L_n}\frac{dt}{2\pi}\oint\limits_{C_n}\frac{dv}{2\pi}\exp\{v\lambda'-t\mu'\}\frac{\exp\{n(S_n(t,\lambda_0)-S_n(v,\lambda_0))\}}{v-t}\\
&\quad+\exp\{x_n(\lambda_0)(\lambda'-\mu')\}\frac{\sin(y_n(\lambda_0)(\lambda'-\mu'))}{\pi(\lambda'-\mu')}\\
&= \exp\{x_n(\lambda_0)(\lambda'-\mu')\}\frac{\sin(y_n(\lambda_0)(\lambda'-\mu'))}{\pi(\lambda'-\mu')}+o(1),\ n\to\infty.
\end{aligned}\tag{3.42}$$

Note that in the proof of Lemma 7 we have shown that $z_n(\lambda)\to z(\lambda)$ as $n\to\infty$ uniformly in $\lambda\in(a,b)\subset\operatorname{supp}N$, where $z_n(\lambda)$ and $z(\lambda)$ are the solutions of equation (3.4) and (3.5). Hence we have $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty}y_n(\lambda)=y(\lambda)=\pi\rho(\lambda)>0$ uniformly in $\lambda\in(a,b)$. Besides, it follows from (3.42) that for $\rho_n(\lambda)=\dfrac{1}{n}K_n(\lambda,\lambda)$ the inequality $|\dfrac{1}{n}K_n(\lambda,\lambda)-y_n(\lambda)|<\varepsilon$ holds uniformly in $\lambda\in(a,b)$, since all bounds were λ-independent. Therefore we have proved that $\rho_n(\lambda)\to\rho(\lambda)$, as $n\to\infty$, uniformly in $\lambda\in(a,b)$. Now we obtain (1.6) by using (2.1) and (3.42).

4 Proof of the Theorem 2.

We start from the following

Lemma 9. *Let $g_n^{(0)}$ and $g^{(0)}$ be defined in (3.3),(3.5). Then we have under conditions of Theorem 2*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\mathbf{P}\{|g_n^{(0)}(z)-g^{(0)}(z)|>\varepsilon\}=0\tag{4.1}$$

uniformly in z from compact set K in the upper half-plane.

Proof. Note that it suffices to prove (4.1) for any $z\in K$. Indeed, let $\{z_j\}_{j=1}^{l}$ be a ε-net of the compact set K. Then there exists N such that for any $n>N$ and for any $\delta>0$

$$\mathbf{P}\{\bigcup_{j=1}^{l}\{|g_n^{(0)}(z_j)-g^{(0)}(z_j)|>\varepsilon\}\}\le\sum_{j=1}^{l}\mathbf{P}\{|g_n^{(0)}(z_j)-g^{(0)}(z_j)|>\varepsilon\}<\delta.$$

Besides, for any $z\in K$ there exists $z_k\in\{z_j\}_{j=1}^{l}$ such that $|z-z_k|<\varepsilon$. Therefore since $\left|\dfrac{d}{d\,z}g_n^{(0)}\right|\le 1/\Im^2 z$, $\left|\dfrac{d}{d\,z}g^{(0)}\right|\le 1/\Im^2 z$

$$|g_n^{(0)}(z)-g^{(0)}(z)|\le|g_n^{(0)}(z_k)-g^{(0)}(z_k)|+2\varepsilon/\Im^2 z.$$

Hence, taking into account that $\Im z$ is bounded from below by a positive constant for $z\in K$, we have for any $n>N$

$$\mathbf{P}\{|g_n^{(0)}(z)-g^{(0)}(z)|<C\varepsilon\}>1-\delta.$$

We are left to prove that (4.1) is valid pointwise. Since

$$\int \lambda^2 d\,N_n^{(0)}(\lambda) < \infty,$$

there exists A such that

$$\int\limits_{|\lambda|>A} d\,N_n^{(0)}(\lambda) \le \frac{1}{A^2}\int \lambda^2 d\,N_n^{(0)}(\lambda) < \varepsilon. \tag{4.2}$$

Set

$$f(\lambda) = \frac{1}{\lambda - z} \quad (\lambda \in \mathbb{R}), \quad f_A(\lambda) = \begin{cases} \dfrac{1}{\lambda - z}, & \lambda \in [-A, A], \\ 0, & \lambda \notin [-A, A], \end{cases}$$

and let f^ε be a piecewise constant function on the segment [-A,A] such that

$$|f^\varepsilon(\lambda) - f_A(\lambda)| < \varepsilon. \tag{4.3}$$

If $f^\varepsilon(\lambda) = f_j$, $\lambda \in \triangle_j$, $j = \overline{1, s}$, then we have from (4.2)

$$\begin{aligned} |g_n^{(0)}(z) - g^{(0)}(z)| \le \left|\int f(\lambda)d\,N_n^{(0)}(\lambda) - \int f_A(\lambda)d\,N_n^{(0)}(\lambda)\right| + \\ \left|\int f_A(\lambda)d\,N_n^{(0)}(\lambda) - \int f_A(\lambda)d\,N_0(\lambda)\right| + \left|\int f_A(\lambda)d\,N_0(\lambda)\right. \\ \left. - \int f(\lambda)d\,N_0(\lambda)\right| \le C\varepsilon + \left|\int f_A(\lambda)d\,N_n^{(0)}(\lambda) - \int f_A(\lambda)d\,N_0(\lambda)\right| \end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

Besides, it follows from (4.3) that

$$\begin{aligned} \left|\int f_A(\lambda)d\,N_n^{(0)}(\lambda) - \int f_A(\lambda)d\,N_0(\lambda)\right| \le \left|\int f_A(\lambda)d\,N_n^{(0)}(\lambda)\right. \\ \left. - \int f^\varepsilon(\lambda)d\,N_n^{(0)}(\lambda)\right| + \left|\int f^\varepsilon(\lambda)d\,N_n^{(0)}(\lambda) - \int f^\varepsilon(\lambda)d\,N_0(\lambda)\right| + \left|\int f^\varepsilon(\lambda)d\,N_0(\lambda)\right. \\ \left. - \int f_A(\lambda)d\,N_0(\lambda)\right| \le 2\varepsilon + \left|\int f^\varepsilon(\lambda)d\,N_n^{(0)}(\lambda) - \int f^\varepsilon(\lambda)d\,N_0(\lambda)\right| \end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

We have also that

$$\left|\int f^\varepsilon(\lambda)d\,N_n^{(0)}(\lambda) - \int f^\varepsilon(\lambda)d\,N_0(\lambda)\right| = \sum_{j=1}^{s} f_j \cdot |N_n^{(0)}(\triangle_j) - N^{(0)}(\triangle_j)|, \tag{4.6}$$

and by the condition of Theorem 2, for any δ there exists N such that for any $n > N$

$$\mathbf{P}\{\bigcup_{j=1}^{l}\{|N_n^{(0)}(\triangle_j) - N^{(0)}(\triangle_j)| > \varepsilon\}\} < \delta. \tag{4.7}$$

Now the assertion of lemma follows from (4.4),(4.5), (4.6), and (4.7). □

Let us take the disk $\omega = \{z : |z(\lambda_0) - z| \le \varepsilon\}$ as the compact set K. Taking into account (4.1), we have that for any small δ there exists N such that for all $n > N$ the set of events Ω_ε such that

$$|g_n^{(0)}(z) - g^{(0)}(z)| < \varepsilon \quad (z \in \omega),$$

satisfies the condition $\mathbf{P}\{\Omega_\varepsilon\} \ge 1 - \delta$.

We want to find for any m

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{(n\rho_n(\lambda_0))^m} R_m^{(n)} \left(\lambda_0 + \frac{x_1}{n\rho_n(\lambda_0)}, \dots, \lambda_0 + \frac{x_m}{n\rho_n(\lambda_0)}\right)$$
$$= \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbf{E}^{(h)} \left\{ \det \left\{ \frac{1}{n\rho_n(\lambda_0)} K_n \left(\lambda_0 + \frac{x_i}{n\rho_n(\lambda_0)}, \lambda_0 + \frac{x_j}{n\rho_n(\lambda_0)} \right) \right\} \right\}. \quad (4.8)$$

Note that the argument used in the proof of Theorem 1 remains valid for all events from Ω_ε. Using the uniform bound for $\frac{1}{n}K_n(\lambda, \lambda)$ which will be proved below (see Lemma 10) we can see that the contribution from $\Omega \setminus \Omega_\varepsilon$ can be bounded by $C\delta$. So, we can divide by $\rho_n(\lambda_0) = \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{E}^{(h)}\{K_n(\lambda_0, \lambda_0)\}$.

Choose small ε and δ and split $\mathbf{E}^{(h)}\{\dots\}$ in (4.8) into two parts: the integral over Ω_ε and the integral over its complement. We can repeat the arguments used in the proof of Theorem 1 for the integral over Ω_ε to obtain the property (1.6). To bound the integral over the complement of Ω_ε we use

Lemma 10. *We have for any set* $\{h_j^{(n)}\}_{j=1}^n$ *and for any* $\lambda = \lambda_0 + \lambda'/n$

$$\left| \frac{1}{n} K_n(\lambda_0 + \lambda'/n, \lambda_0 + \lambda'/n) \right| \le C, \quad (4.9)$$

where K_n *is defined in (2.2).*

Proof. As in the proof of Theorem 1, take C_n as a contour C and move the integration with respect to t from L to L_n. Using (3.41) as in (3.42) we obtain

$$\frac{1}{n}K_n(\lambda, \lambda) = -\int_{L_n} \frac{dt}{2\pi} \oint_{C_n} \frac{dv}{2\pi} \exp\{\lambda'(v-t)\} \frac{\exp\{n(S_n(t, \lambda_0) - S_n(v, \lambda_0))\}}{v - t} - \frac{y_n(\lambda_0)}{\pi}. \quad (4.10)$$

If $y_n(\lambda) \ne 0$, then (3.12) implies that $|y_n(\lambda)| \le 1$, thus $y_n(\lambda)$ is bounded uniformly in n for any λ, in particle, for $\lambda = \lambda_0$. Hence, to prove the lemma it is necessary and sufficient to check the uniform bound for the double integral in (4.10).

We need the following

Lemma 11. *Let* $J = [x_n(\lambda_0); x_n(\lambda_1)]$ *moreover* $|J| = 1$. *Then there exists n-independent constant δ, such that*

$$|\Re S_n(z_n(\lambda_1), \lambda_0) - \Re S_n(z_n(\lambda_0), \lambda_0)| \ge \delta / \ln^{12} n. \quad (4.11)$$

The lemma will be proved after the proof of Lemma 10.

Consider the integral in (4.10). Let $I = [x_n(\lambda_1), x_n(\lambda_2)]$ be a segment such that $|x_n(\lambda_1) - x_n(\lambda_0)| = |x_n(\lambda_2) - x_n(\lambda_0)| = 1$. Since $\Re S_n(z_n(\lambda_0), \lambda_0) = 0$, according to Lemma 11 we have

$$\Re S_n(z_n(\lambda), \lambda_0) \le -\delta / \ln^{12} n$$

outside of I for some n-independent $\delta > 0$. Hence, since length of C_n is $O(n)$ $(n \to \infty)$ (see Lemma 8) and the integral with respect to t is bounded, the whole integral over this part of C_n is bounded uniformly in n.

Therefore, we should bound the integral over that part of C_n, where $x_n(\lambda) \in I$. Note also that if $\Im t$ is big, then the integral is evidently bounded by some constant (expression under the integral decrease exponentially at the infinity), thus it suffices to bound the integral

$$\int_J \frac{dt}{2\pi} \int_{C_n^{(I)}} \frac{d\,v}{2\pi} \exp\{\lambda'(v-t)\} \frac{\exp\{n(S_n(t,\lambda_0) - S_n(v,\lambda_0))\}}{v-t},$$

where J is a finite segment of L_n. In view of the bound

$$\int_J \frac{d\,t}{\sqrt{(x-x_0)^2 + (t-y(x))^2}} \le \sqrt{2} \int_J \frac{d\,t}{|x-x_0| + |t-y(x)|} \le 2\sqrt{2} \ln|x-x_0|^{-1} + C,$$

where $x_0 = x_n(\lambda_0)$, we have to estimate the integral

$$\int_I (\ln|x-x_0|^{-1} + C) l'(x) d\,x, \tag{4.12}$$

where $l(x)$ is the length of the part of C_n between x_0 and x. We find from (3.39) that

$$-\ln(x-x_0) \le -C \ln l(x),$$

and, therefore, we obtain for (4.12)

$$\int_I (\ln|x-x_0|^{-1} + C) l'(x) d\,x \le \int_I (C + \ln l(x))\, l'(x) d\,x$$
$$= C \cdot l(x_1) - l(x_1) \ln l(x_1) \le C.$$

□

Proof of Lemma 11. Consider two cases.

1) Let there exist a segment $\triangle = [x_n(\xi_1); x_n(\xi_2)] \subset J$, such that $|\triangle| \ge 1/(2\ln^2 n)$ and if $x_n(\lambda) \in \triangle$, then $|y_n(\lambda)| \ge 1/(2\ln^2 n)$.

We have from (3.14)

$$\Re S_n(z_n(\lambda_1), \lambda_0) - \Re S_n(z_n(\lambda_0), \lambda_0) = \int_{\lambda_0}^{\lambda_1} x_n'(\lambda)(\lambda - \lambda_0) d\,\lambda$$
$$\ge \int_{\frac{\xi_1+\xi_2}{2}}^{\xi_2} x_n'(\lambda)(\lambda-\lambda_0) d\,\lambda \ge \frac{(\xi_2-\xi_1)^2}{4} \min_{\lambda \in [\frac{\xi_1+\xi_2}{2};\xi_2]} x_n'(\lambda) \tag{4.13}$$

According to (3.11)

$$x_n'(\lambda) = \frac{a_n(\lambda)}{a_n^2(\lambda) + b_n^2(\lambda)} \le \frac{1}{a_n(\lambda)}.$$

Using the notations (3.32), we get from (3.13)

$$a_n(\lambda) = 2y_n^2(\lambda)\sigma_2 \geq (\sqrt{2}y_n(\lambda)\sigma_1)^2 = 2y_n^2(\lambda).$$

Hence, we have for $x_n(\lambda) \in \triangle$

$$a_n(\lambda) \geq 1/(2\ln^4 n),$$

and

$$x_n'(\lambda) \leq 2\ln^4 n.$$

Therefore,

$$1/(2\ln^2 n) \leq |\triangle| = x_n(\xi_2) - x_n(\xi_1) = x_n'(\theta)(\xi_2 - \xi_1) \leq 2\ln^4 n \cdot (\xi_2 - \xi_1),$$

i.e.,

$$\xi_2 - \xi_1 \geq 1/(4\ln^6 n).$$

Using (3.32) and the Schwartz inequality, we obtain

$$b_n^2(\lambda) = (2y_n(\lambda)\sigma_{21})^2 \leq 2\sigma_{22} \cdot 2y_n^2(\lambda)\sigma_2 = 2a_n(\lambda)\sigma_{22}.$$

This, (3.11), (3.13) and (3.12) yield

$$x_n'(\lambda) = \frac{a_n(\lambda)}{a_n^2(\lambda) + b_n^2(\lambda)} \geq \frac{a_n(\lambda)}{a_n^2(\lambda) + 2a_n(\lambda)\sigma_{22}} = \frac{1}{a_n(\lambda) + 2\sigma_{22}} = \frac{1}{2}.$$

Now, returning to (4.13), we get

$$\begin{aligned}\Re S_n(z_n(\lambda_1), \lambda_0) - \Re S_n(z_n(\lambda_0), \lambda_0) &\geq \frac{(\xi_2 - \xi_1)^2}{4} \min_{\lambda \in [\frac{\xi_1+\xi_2}{2};\xi_2]} x_n'(\lambda) \\ &\geq \frac{(\xi_2 - \xi_1)^2}{8} \geq \frac{1}{128\ln^{12} n}\end{aligned}$$

So the assertion of lemma is proved in this case.

2) Consider now the case when there is no segment $\triangle$, described in the case 1. Then the segment J has inside at most $n/\ln^2 n$ of $\{h_j^{(n)}\}_{j=1}^n$. Indeed, assume the opposite, let J have inside more than $n/\ln^2 n$ of $\{h_j^{(n)}\}_{j=1}^n$. Split the segment J into segments with the length $1/(2\ln^2 n)$. One of these segments (denote it by J_1) contains more than $n/(2\ln^4 n)$ of $\{h_j^{(n)}\}_{j=1}^n$. Consider λ such that $x_n(\lambda) \in J_1$. We have for such λ and any $h_j^{(n)} \in J_1$

$$|x_n(\lambda) - h_j^{(n)}| < 1/(2\ln^2 n).$$

Since J_1 contains more than $n/(2\ln^4 n)$ of $\{h_j^{(n)}\}$, we get from (3.12)

$$1 = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{1}{(x_n(\lambda) - h_j^{(n)})^2 + y_n^2(\lambda)} \geq \frac{1}{2\ln^4 n} \cdot \frac{1}{1/(4\ln^4 n) + y_n^2(\lambda)},$$

and, hence, we obtain for such λ

$$|y_n(\lambda)| \geq \sqrt{1/(2\ln^4)n - 1/(4\ln^4 n)} = 1/(2\ln^2 n),$$

which contradicts to our assumption.

Thus, the segment J has inside at most $n/\ln^2 n$ of $\{h_j^{(n)}\}_{j=1}^n$ in this case. Let us show now that there is a n-independent constant δ such that

$$|\Re S_n(z_n(\lambda_1),\lambda_0) - \Re S_n(z_n(\lambda_0),\lambda_0)| \geq \delta. \tag{4.14}$$

Consider the function

$$\widehat{S}_n(z,\lambda_0) = \frac{z^2}{2} + \frac{1}{n}\sum_{h_j^{(n)}\notin J} \ln(z - h_j^{(n)}) - \lambda_0\, z + C. \tag{4.15}$$

We have for this function

$$|\Re S_n(z_n(\lambda),\lambda_0) - \Re\widehat{S}_n(z_n(\lambda),\lambda_0)| = \left|\frac{1}{2n}\sum_{h_j^{(n)}\in J} \ln((x_n(\lambda) - h_j^{(n)})^2 + y_n^2(\lambda))\right| \leq \frac{\ln n}{2\ln^2 n} \to 0.$$

Therefore, it suffices to prove (4.14) only for $\widehat{S}_n(z_n(\lambda),\lambda_0)$. We know that $\Re S_n(z_n(\lambda),\lambda_0)$ is monotone for $\lambda \in J$. Taking into account that the difference between $\Re\widehat{S}_n$ and $\Re S_n$ converges to zero uniformly, it suffices to find two points $x_n(\lambda)$ and $x_n(\mu)$ in J such that

$$|\Re\widehat{S}_n(z_n(\lambda),\lambda_0) - \Re\widehat{S}_n(z_n(\mu),\lambda_0)| \geq \delta \tag{4.16}$$

for some n-independent δ.

Replace J by the segment J', obtained from J by the exclusion of a small ε-neighborhood of its endpoints. Note that

$$\frac{d^4}{d\,x^4}\left(\Re\widehat{S}_n(x,\lambda_0)\right) = -\frac{6}{n}\sum_{h_j^{(n)}\notin J} \frac{1}{(x - h_j^{(n)})^4}. \tag{4.17}$$

Split J' into three segments and choose an arbitrary $c < 1$. It is evident that the forth derivative (4.17) is convex, and, hence, one can choose such third of J' that $\left|\frac{d^4}{d\,\lambda^4}\left(\Re\widehat{S}_n(x_n(\lambda),\lambda_0)\right)\right| > c$ or $\left|\frac{d^4}{d\,\lambda^4}\left(\Re\widehat{S}_n(x_n(\lambda),\lambda_0)\right)\right| < c$ on it.

If $\left|\frac{d^4}{d\,\lambda^4}\left(\Re\widehat{S}_n(x_n(\lambda),\lambda_0)\right)\right| > c$ for this third, then use the following elementary

Proposition 2. *Let f be a $C^4[a;b]$ function. Assume that there exists a constant $A > 0$ such that*

$$\left|\frac{d^4}{d\,x^4}f(x)\right| \geq A,\ \ x \in [a;b]$$

Then there exist $C = C(A,|b-a|)$, and $\delta = \delta(A,|b-a|)$, and segments $\triangle_1,\triangle_2 \subset [a;b]$, $|\triangle_1|,|\triangle_2| > \delta$ such that for any $x_1 \in \triangle_1$, $x_2 \in \triangle_2$

$$|f(x_1) - f(x_2)| \geq C.$$

Since $\hat{S}$ satisfies the condition of the proposition, there exist $\triangle_1,\triangle_2 \subset J'$ such that we have for any $x_1 \in \triangle_1$ and any $x_2 \in \triangle_2$

$$|\Re\widehat{S}_n(x_1,\lambda_0) - \Re\widehat{S}_n(x_2,\lambda_0)| \geq \delta. \tag{4.18}$$

It is easy to see that both $\triangle_1$ and $\triangle_2$ contain $x_n(\lambda)$ for which the corresponding $y_n(\lambda)$ obeys the inequality $y < 1/\ln^4 n$ (or we have the case 1). We obtain for these points

$$|\Re\widehat{S}_n(z_n(\lambda),\lambda_0) - \Re\widehat{S}_n(x_n(\lambda),\lambda_0)| = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{h_j^{(n)}\notin J} \ln\left(1 + \frac{y_n^2(\lambda)}{(x_n(\lambda) - h_j^{(n)})^2}\right)$$
$$\le \frac{1}{n}\sum_{h_j^{(n)}\notin J} \frac{y_n^2(\lambda)}{(x_n(\lambda) - h_j^{(n)})^2} \le 1/(\varepsilon\cdot\ln^8 n)$$

This and (4.18) imply (4.16), thus (4.14).

If $\left|\dfrac{d^4}{d\,\lambda^4}\left(\Re\widehat{S}_n(x_n(\lambda),\lambda_0)\right)\right| < c$, then we consider the second derivative

$$\frac{d^2}{d\,\lambda^2}\left(\Re\widehat{S}_n(x_n(\lambda),\lambda_0)\right) = 1 - \frac{1}{n}\sum_{h_j^{(n)}\notin J}\frac{1}{(x_n(\lambda) - h_j^{(n)})^2}. \tag{4.19}$$

Note that

$$\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{h_j^{(n)}\notin J}\frac{1}{(x_n(\lambda) - h_j^{(n)})^2}\right)^2 \le \frac{1}{n}\sum_{h_j^{(n)}\notin J}\frac{1}{(x_n(\lambda) - h_j^{(n)})^4} \le c/6.$$

This and (4.19) yield

$$\left|\frac{d^2}{d\,\lambda^2}(\Re\widehat{S}_n(x_n(\lambda),\lambda_0))\right| \ge 1 - \sqrt{c/6}.$$

This bound implies (4.14) by the same argument as in Proposition 2 . Thus, since the condition (4.11) is more weak than the condition (4.14), we have proved (4.11) in any case. $\square$

Note that according to the Hadamard inequality

$$\det\left\{\frac{1}{n}K_n\left(\lambda_0 + \frac{x_i}{n}, \lambda_0 + \frac{x_j}{n}\right)\right\}_{i,j=1}^m$$
$$\le \prod_{i=1}^m\left(\sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{n}K_n\left(\lambda_0 + \frac{x_i}{n}, \lambda_0 + \frac{x_j}{n}\right)\frac{1}{n}K_n\left(\lambda_0 + \frac{x_j}{n}, \lambda_0 + \frac{x_i}{n}\right)\right)^{1/2}. \tag{4.20}$$

Since the second marginal density is positive,

$$K_n(x,y)K_n(y,x) \le K_n(x,x)K_n(y,y).$$

According to Lemma 9 this means that

$$\det\left\{\frac{1}{n}K_n\left(\lambda_0 + \frac{x_i}{n}, \lambda_0 + \frac{x_j}{n}\right)\right\}_{i,j=1}^m \le m^{m/2}C^m,$$

and, hence, the integral over the complement of Ω_ε in (4.8) can be bounded by $C\delta$. Since we can take δ small arbitrary, the condition (1.6) is proved.

5 Appendix.

We present here certain facts of the Grassmann variables and the Grassmann integration. An introduction to this theory is given in [13] and [14], and in this section we will follow to these books.

5.1 Grassmann algebra Λ.

Let us consider the set of formal variables $\{\psi_j\}_{j=1}^n$, which satisfy the following anticommutation conditions

$$\psi_j\psi_k + \psi_k\psi_j = 0, \quad j,k = \overline{1,n}.$$

In particular, for $k = j$ we obtain

$$\psi_j^2 = 0.$$

To any variable ψ_j we put into correspondence another variable $\overline{\psi}_j$, which we call *the conjugate* of ψ_j. We assume that these conjugate variables $\{\overline{\psi}_j\}_{j=1}^n$ also anticommute with each others and with $\{\psi_j\}_{j=1}^n$:

$$\overline{\psi}_j\psi_k + \psi_k\overline{\psi}_j = \overline{\psi}_j\overline{\psi}_k + \overline{\psi}_k\overline{\psi}_j = 0.$$

These two sets of variables $\{\psi_j\}_{j=1}^n$ and $\{\overline{\psi}_j\}_{j=1}^n$ generate the Grassmann algebra Λ. Taking into account that $\psi_j^2 = 0$, we have that all elements of Λ are some polynomials of $\{\psi_j\}$ and $\{\overline{\psi}_j\}$. One can extend the operation of conjugation to the whole Λ by setting

$$\overline{\alpha\psi} = \overline{\alpha}\overline{\psi}, \quad \overline{\overline{\psi}} = -\psi, \quad \overline{\psi_1\psi_2} = \overline{\psi_1\psi_2}.$$

We can also define functions of Grassmann variables. Let χ be some element of Λ. For any analytical function f by $f(\chi)$ we mean the element of Λ obtained by substituting χ in the Taylor series of f near zero. Since χ is a polynomial of $\{\psi_j\}$, $\{\overline{\psi}_j\}$, there exists such l that $\chi^l = 0$, and hence the series terminates after a finite number of terms and so $f(\chi) \in \Lambda$.

Let us also call by a *numerical part* of some function of Grassmann's elements its value obtained by putting all ψ_j and $\overline{\psi}_j$ formally equal to zero (in other word, the first coefficient of Taylor series).

5.2 Linear algebra over Λ

A super-vector of the first type is defined as a $(n+m)$ dimensional vector-column whose first m coordinates $\{\chi_j\}_{j=1}^m$ are anticommuting elements of Λ (i.e.,an elements containing only terms of odd power) and the last n coordinates $\{s_j\}_{j=1}^n$ are commuting ones (i.e.,elements containing only terms of even power):

$$\Phi_1 = (\chi_1, \ldots, \chi_m, s_1, \ldots, s_n)^t.$$

One can also consider super-vectors of the second type: a $(m+n)$ dimensional vector-column whose first m coordinates $\{s_j\}_{j=1}^m$ are commuting elements and the last n coordinates $\{\chi_j\}_{j=1}^n$ are anticommuting ones:

$$\Phi_2 = (s_1, \ldots, s_m, \chi_1, \ldots, \chi_n)^t.$$

The Hermitian conjugate Φ^+ is given by the following expression:

$$\Phi_1^+ = (\overline{\chi}_1, \ldots, \overline{\chi}_m, \overline{s}_1, \ldots, \overline{s}_n), \quad \Phi_2^+ = (\overline{s}_1, \ldots, \overline{s}_m, \overline{\chi}_1, \ldots, \overline{\chi}_n)$$

Super-vectors of each type obviously form a linear space. A linear transformation in these spaces are realized by super-matrices:

$$\widetilde{\Phi} = F\,\Phi, \quad F = \left(\begin{array}{cc} a & \sigma \\ \rho & b \end{array} \right),$$

where a and b are $n \times n$ and $m \times m$ matrices containing only commuting elements of algebra, σ and ρ are $n \times m$ and $m \times n$ matrices containing only anticommuting ones.

Two super-matrices F and G can be multiplied in a usual way

$$(F\,G)_{j,k} = \sum_{l=1}^{m+n} F_{j,l} G_{l,k}.$$

Now let us define super-analogs of traces and determinants of matrices.

$$\mathrm{str}\, F = \mathrm{Tr}\, a - \mathrm{Tr}\, b, \quad \mathrm{sdet}\, F = \frac{\det\, (a - \sigma\, b^{-1}\, \rho)}{\det\, b}.$$

These definitions look very unusual but they allow us to preserve some basic properties of traces and determinants (see [14]):

$$\mathrm{str}\, (FG) = \mathrm{str}\, (GF), \quad \mathrm{sdet}\, (FG) = \mathrm{sdet}\, F \cdot \mathrm{sdet}\, G, \quad \ln \mathrm{sdet}\, F = \mathrm{str}\, \ln\, F.$$

Super-analog of Hermitian conjugation of matrices can be defined as

$$F^+ = \left(\begin{array}{cc} a^+ & -\rho^+ \\ \sigma^+ & b^+ \end{array} \right), \quad (FG)^+ = G^+ F^+, \quad (F^+)^+ = F.$$

According to this definition one can introduce a Hermitian and unitary super matrices. The Hermitian super-matrix F satisfies the condition $F^+ = F$ while the unitary super-matrix F satisfies the condition $F^+\, F = F\, F^+ = 1$.

Similarly to ordinary matrices, Hermitian super-matrices can be diagonalized by unitary super-matrices (see also [14]).

Indeed, an arbitrary Hermitian super-matrix has the form

$$F = \left(\begin{array}{cc} a & \sigma \\ \sigma^+ & b \end{array} \right),$$

where a and b are $n \times n$ Hermitian matrices containing only commuting elements of algebra and σ is a $n \times n$ matrix containing only anticommuting ones. Suppose that all numerical parts of the eigenvalues of the matrices a and b are distinct (the eigenvalues of matrices containing only commuting elements can be defined by the same way as for ordinary matrices. The way to find roots of the characteristic polynomial is described below). Find such commuting elements λ that

$$F \left(\begin{array}{c} S \\ \chi \end{array} \right) = \lambda \left(\begin{array}{c} S \\ \chi \end{array} \right)$$

or

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} (a-\lambda)S+\sigma\chi=0 \\ \sigma^{+}S+(b-\lambda)\chi=0 \end{array} \right. . \tag{5.1}$$

Excluding χ, we get the system of linear equations for $S=(s_1,\ldots,s_n)$:

$$((a-\lambda)-\sigma\,(b-\lambda)^{-1}\sigma^{+})\,S=0. \tag{5.2}$$

If $\det((a-\lambda)-\sigma\,(b-\lambda)^{-1}\sigma^{+})=0$, then the system (5.2) has a nontrivial solution, i.e., some solution with a nonzero numerical part. Indeed, consider a maximum minor of the matrix $C(\lambda)=(a-\lambda)-\sigma\,(b-\lambda)^{-1}\sigma^{+}$ with a nonzero numerical part. Since $\mathrm{rank}\,(a-\lambda)\geq n-1$ (because all eigenvalues of a are distinct) and $\det C(\lambda)=0$, the rank of this minor is $(n-1)$. Without loss of generality we can assume that it is an upper right minor. The last equation of the system can be omitted, and the first $(n-1)$ one can be solved with respect to $s_1,s_2,\ldots,s_{n-1}$ with a parameter s_n by using the Kramer rule (since a numerical part of the main determinant is nonzero, we can divide by it). Taking arbitrary $s_n\neq 0$, we obtain a nontrivial solution.

Thus, if $\det C(\lambda)=0$, then the system (5.2) has a nontrivial solution. Having this solution, one can construct

$$\chi=-(b-\lambda)^{-1}\sigma^{+}S, \quad \chi^{+}=-S^{+}\sigma(b-\lambda)^{-1}, \tag{5.3}$$

which represents a solution of the system (5.1). Choosing a constant, we can obtain a normalized solution of the system, i.e., the solution $\Phi=(S,\,\chi)^t$ such that $\Phi^{+}\Phi=S^{+}S+\chi^{+}\chi\;=\;1$.

Hence, we should find the solutions of the equation

$$\det((a-\lambda)-\sigma\,(b-\lambda)^{-1}\sigma^{+})\;=\;0, \tag{5.4}$$

i.e.,the roots of some polynomial (denote it by $f(x)$) whose coefficients are elements of Λ. Let us seek these roots by the Newton method using the eigenvalues of the matrix a as a zero approximation.

Let

$$x_1=\lambda_0, \quad x_n=x_{n-1}-\frac{f(x_{n-1})}{f'(x_{n-1})}.$$

It can be prove by induction that $f(x_n)=f(x_1)^n\cdot g(x_n)$ and the numerical part of $f(x_1)$ is zero. Since there exists N such that $f^N(x_1)=0$, for $n>N$ $f(x_n)=0$. This means that for $n>N$ $x_n=x_N$ and so x_N is the solution of $f(x)=0$, corresponding to λ.

In such a way we find n eigenvalues and the normalized eigenvectors of the type $\Phi=(S,\,\chi)^t$, corresponding to these eigenvalues.

Similarly we can find the eigenvectors of the type $\Phi=(\chi,\,S)^t$, but in this case we should use the eigenvalues of the matrix b instead of a. It is easy to show that the eigenvectors corresponding to the distinct eigenvalues are orthogonal to each other. So constructing the super-matrix from all these vectors, we obtain the unitary matrix U, diagonalizing F.

As an example consider the case $n=1$. In this case we have

$$F=\left(\begin{array}{cc} a & \sigma \\ \overline{\sigma} & b \end{array}\right),$$

where a and b are distinct real numbers, σ is some anticommuting element of Λ.

Equation (5.4) has the form

$$(a-\lambda)-\frac{\sigma\,\overline{\sigma}}{b-\lambda}=\ 0, \quad f(x)=(a-\lambda)(b-\lambda)-\sigma\,\overline{\sigma}.$$

As a zero approximation we should take a:

$$f(a)=-\sigma\,\overline{\sigma}, \quad f'(a)=a-b.$$

Hence,

$$x_2=a+\frac{\sigma\,\overline{\sigma}}{a-b},$$

and therefore

$$f(x_2)=-\frac{\sigma\,\overline{\sigma}}{a-b}(b-a-\frac{\sigma\,\overline{\sigma}}{a-b})-\sigma\,\overline{\sigma}=0.$$

Thus, one of the eigenvalues is

$$\lambda_1=a+\frac{\sigma\,\overline{\sigma}}{a-b}.$$

Find the normalized eigenvector of the type $\Phi=(S,\,\chi)^t$, corresponding to this eigenvalue. The system (5.2) in this case is degenerated, and so $S=(s_1)$ is arbitrary. From (5.3) we obtain that

$$\chi=\frac{\overline{\sigma}\,S}{a-b}, \quad \chi^+=-\frac{\sigma\,S}{a-b}.$$

Hence

$$S^2+\chi^+\chi=S^2(1-\frac{\overline{\sigma}\sigma}{(a-b)^2}).$$

So to normalize the vector we should take

$$S=1+\frac{\overline{\sigma}\sigma}{2(a-b)^2}.$$

Thus, the eigenvector corresponding to the eigenvalue λ_1 has the form

$$\Phi_1=\begin{pmatrix} 1+\dfrac{\overline{\sigma}\sigma}{2(a-b)^2} \\ \dfrac{\overline{\sigma}}{a-b} \end{pmatrix}$$

Similarly the second eigenvalue (corresponding to b) is

$$\lambda_2=b+\frac{\sigma\,\overline{\sigma}}{a-b},$$

and the eigenvector corresponding to this eigenvalue has the form

$$\Phi_2=\begin{pmatrix} -\dfrac{\sigma}{a-b} \\ 1-\dfrac{\overline{\sigma}\sigma}{2(a-b)^2} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Constructing the super-matrix

$$U=\begin{pmatrix} 1+\dfrac{\overline{\sigma}\sigma}{2(a-b)^2} & -\dfrac{\sigma}{a-b} \\ \dfrac{\overline{\sigma}}{a-b} & 1-\dfrac{\overline{\sigma}\sigma}{2(a-b)^2} \end{pmatrix},$$

from these vectors we get that

$$U^{+}FU=\left(\begin{array}{cc} a+\dfrac{\sigma\overline{\sigma}}{a-b} & 0 \\ 0 & b+\dfrac{\sigma\overline{\sigma}}{a-b} \end{array}\right).$$

5.3 Integral over Λ.

Following Berezin[13], we define the operation of integration with respect to the anticommuting variables in a formally way:

$$\int d\,\psi_j=\int d\overline{\psi}_j=0,\quad \int \psi_j d\,\psi_j=\int \overline{\psi}_j d\overline{\psi}_j=1.$$

This definition can be extend on the general element of Λ by the linearity. A multiple integral is defined to be repeated integral. The "differentials" $d\,\psi_j$ and $d\,\overline{\psi}_k$ anticommute with each other and with the variables ψ_j and $\overline{\psi}_k$.

Therefore, if

$$f(\chi_1,\ldots,\chi_m)=a_0+\sum_{j_1=1}^{m}a_{j_1}\chi_{j_1}+\sum_{j_1<j_2}a_{j_1j_2}\chi_{j_1}\chi_{j_2}+\ldots+a_{1,2,\ldots,m}\chi_1\cdots\chi_m,$$

then

$$\int f(\chi_1,\ldots,\chi_m)d\,\chi_m\ldots d\,\chi_1=a_{1,2,\ldots,m}.$$

Let now $f=f(X,\chi)$, where $\chi=(\chi_1,\ldots,\chi_m)$ is a vector of the anticommuting elements of Λ, end $X=(x_1,\ldots,x_n)$ is a vector of the commuting ones. Let y_i be a numerical part of x_i. Then

$$\int\int f(X,\chi)d\,x_1\ldots d\,x_n d\,\chi_m\ldots d\,\chi_1=\int_{\widetilde{U}}\int f(Y,\chi)d\,y_1\ldots d\,y_n d\,\chi_m\ldots d\,\chi_1,$$

where $\widetilde{U}$ is a domain, where coordinates $Y=(y_1,\ldots,y_n)$ vary, and integral over $\widetilde{U}$ is a usual Lebesgues integral.

Let A be an ordinary Hermitian matrix. The following Gaussian integral is well-known

$$\int \exp\{-\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}A_{j,k}z_j\overline{z}_k\}\prod_{j=1}^{n}\frac{d\,\Re z_j d\,\Im z_j}{\pi}=\frac{1}{\det A}. \tag{5.5}$$

One of the most important formulas of the super-symmetry method is an analog of formula (5.5) for Grassmann variables [13]:

$$\int \exp\{-\sum_{j,k=1}^{n}A_{j,k}\overline{\psi}_j\psi_k\}\prod_{j=1}^{n}d\,\overline{\psi}_j d\,\psi_j=\det A. \tag{5.6}$$

Combining these two formulas, we obtain another important one: if F is a Hermitian super-matrix and $\Phi=(X,\chi)^t$ is a super-vector, then

$$\int \exp\{-\Phi^{+}F\Phi\}d\,\Phi^{+}d\,\Phi=\mathrm{sdet}^{-1}F, \tag{5.7}$$

where

$$d\,\Phi^{+}d\,\Phi=\prod_{j=1}^{m}\overline{\chi}_j\chi_j\prod_{j=1}^{n}\frac{\Re x_j\Im x_j}{\pi}.$$

5.4 Derivatives with respect to anticommuting variables.

Let us define the left and the right derivatives with respect to anticommuting variables. Since any element of the algebra Λ is a polynomial of $\{\psi_j\}$ and $\{\overline{\psi}_j\}$, it is sufficient to define derivatives only for monomials and then extend by the linearity.

We define the left derivative as (see [13]):

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \chi_j}\chi_{i_1}\dots\chi_{i_k} = \begin{cases} 0, & i_1,\dots,i_k \neq j, \\ (-1)^{s-1}\chi_{i_1}\dots\chi_{i_{s-1}}\chi_{i_{s+1}}\dots\chi_{i_k}, & i_s = j. \end{cases}$$

The right derivative differs from the left one by sign:

$$\chi_{i_1}\dots\chi_{i_k}\frac{\partial}{\partial \chi_j} = \begin{cases} 0, & i_1,\dots,i_k \neq j, \\ (-1)^{k-s}\chi_{i_1}\dots\chi_{i_{s-1}}\chi_{i_{s+1}}\dots\chi_{i_k}, & i_s = j. \end{cases}$$

Note that for the odd elements the left and the right derivatives are equal and so in this case we can use the usual notation $\dfrac{\partial f}{\partial \chi}$.

5.5 Change of variables in integrals.

Consider the integral

$$\int\limits_U\int f(X,\chi)d\,\chi d\,X, \qquad (5.8)$$

where $X = (x_1,\dots,x_n)$ are commuting variables whose numerical parts vary in the domain U, and $\chi = (\chi_1,\dots,\chi_m)$ are anticommuting ones.

Change of variables in the integral (5.8) is a transformation from one system of generators of Λ to another one preserving the evenness

$$x_i = x_i(Y,\eta), \quad \chi_i = \chi_i(Y,\eta), \qquad (5.9)$$

where $Y = (y_1,\dots,y_n)$ are commuting variables, whose numerical parts vary in the domain $\widetilde{U}$, and $\eta = (\eta_1,\dots,\eta_m)$ are anticommuting ones.

Change of variables in an ordinary integral leads to the appearance of the Jacobian which is equal to the determinant of the partial derivatives matrix. For the super-integrals the situation is similar.

Let f be a finite function in the domain U, i.e., supp$f$ (with respect to the numerical part of the vector X) is inside the domain U. Then (see [13])

$$\int\limits_U\int f(X,\chi)d\,\chi d\,X = \int\limits_{\widetilde{U}}\int f(X(Y,\eta),\chi(Y,\eta))\triangle(\{X,\chi\}/\{Y,\eta\})d\,\chi d\,X, \qquad (5.10)$$

where

$$\triangle(\{X,\chi\}/\{Y,\eta\}) = \mathrm{sdet}R, \quad R = \begin{pmatrix} a & \alpha \\ \beta & b \end{pmatrix}, \qquad (5.11)$$

$$\begin{aligned} a_{ik} &= \frac{\partial x_i}{\partial y_k} & \alpha_{ik} &= x_i\frac{\partial}{\partial \eta_k} \\ \beta_{ik} &= \frac{\partial \chi_i}{\partial y_k} & b &= \frac{\partial \chi_i}{\partial \eta_k} \end{aligned}$$

The function $\triangle(\{X,\chi\}/\{Y,\eta\})$ is often called *Berezinian* of the change (5.9).

Note that differently from the ordinary integrals, in the case of super-integrals if f is not a finite function in the domain U, then formula (5.10) is not correct. There are some extra terms appearing in it.

Let the domain U be defined by the condition $u(X)>0$ for some function u. Denote by $v(Y,\eta)$ the function $u(X(Y,\eta))$, and let $v(Y)$ be the numerical part of $v(Y,\eta)$. In new coordinates the domain U will be defined by the condition $v(Y)>0$ and (see [13])

$$\int\limits_{U}\int f(X,\chi)d\,\chi d\,X=\int\limits_{\widetilde{U}}\int f(X(Y,\eta),\chi(Y,\eta))\triangle(\{X,\chi\}/\{Y,\eta\})d\,\chi d\,X$$
$$+\int f(X(Y,\eta),\chi(Y,\eta))\triangle(\{X,\chi\}/\{Y,\eta\})\delta(v(Y))(v(Y,\eta)-v(Y))d\,\chi d\,X+\dots,\quad(5.12)$$

where dots means the sum of terms containing $\delta^{(k)}(v(Y))$ under the integral, i.e., all extra terms are integrals along the boundary of the domain U.

Let

$$F=\begin{pmatrix} a & \sigma\\ \sigma^+ & ib\end{pmatrix},\quad G=\begin{pmatrix} c & \eta\\ \eta^+ & id\end{pmatrix}.$$

Then F and G can be diagonalized, i.e., there exist unitary super-matrices U and V such that

$$\begin{array}{ll} F=U^{-1}SU, & S=\mathrm{diag}\,(s_{11},\dots,s_{1m},is_{21},\dots,s_{2m}),\\ G=V^{-1}RV, & R=\mathrm{diag}\,(r_{11},\dots,r_{1m},ir_{21},\dots,r_{2m}).\end{array}$$

Consider the integral

$$2^{m(m-1)}\int\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2t}\mathrm{str}(F-G)^2\right)d\,G,$$

where

$$d\,G=\frac{1}{\pi^{m^2}}\prod_{j=1}^{m}d\,c_{j,j}d\,d_{j,j}\prod_{j<k}d\,\Re c_{j,k}d\,\Im c_{j,k}d\,\Re d_{j,k}d\,\Im d_{j,k}\prod_{j,k=1}^{m}d\,\overline{\eta}_{j,k}d\,\eta_{j,k}.$$

If we make the change $G=V^{-1}RV$, the differential $d\,G$ will transform into the form (see [12])

$$d\,G=B_m(R)^2d\,Rd\,\mu(V)$$

where $d\,R=d\,r_{11}\dots d\,r_{2m}$, $d\,\mu(V)$ is the Haar measure of the group of unitary super-matrices, and $B_m(R)^2$ is a Berezinian of this change, which equals to the square of the Cauchy determinant

$$B_m(R)=\det\left[\frac{1}{r_{1j}-ir_{2k}}\right].\quad(5.13)$$

We will use also the generalization of the Harish-Chandra/Itzykson-Zuber formula for the case of Grassmann variables. Let us recall that the Harish-Chandra/Itzykson-Zuber formula has the form (see, for example, [5]):

$$\int\exp\{\mathrm{Tr}\,AU^*BU\}d\,U=\frac{\det\{\exp(a_ib_j)\}}{\triangle(A)\triangle(B)},$$

where A, B are Hermitian matrices, a_i, b_j are their eigenvalues, $d\,U$ is an integration over the group of unitary matrices, and $\triangle(A)$ is the Vandermonde determinant constructing of the eigenvalues of the matrix A, i.e.,

$$\triangle(A) = \prod_{i<j}(a_i - a_j)$$

The super-analog of this formula has the form (see [12]):

$$2^{m(m-1)}\int \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2t}\mathrm{str}(F-G)^2\right) d\,\mu(V)$$

$$= (1-\eta(S))\frac{\delta(R)}{B_m^2(R)} + \frac{1}{(2\pi t)^m}\frac{\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2t}\mathrm{str}(S-R)^2\right)}{B_m(S)B_m(R)}, \quad (5.14)$$

where

$$\eta(S) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if any two } s_{1j}=0,\ s_{2k}=0, \\ 1, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Acknowledgements. The author is grateful to Prof.L.A.Pastur for statement of the problem and fruitful discussion.

References

[1] *P. Deift, T. Kriecherbauer, K. McLaughlin, S. Venakides, X. Zhou*, Uniform asymptotics for polynomials orthogonal with respect to varying exponential weights and applications to universality questions in random matrix theory. - Commun. Pure Appl. Math.(1999), 52, p. 1335-1425

[2] *L. Pastur, M. Shcherbina*, Universality of the local eigenvalue statistics for a class of unitary invariant random matrix ensembles. - J. Stat. Phys.(1997), 86, p.109-147

[3] *L. Pastur, M. Shcherbina*, Bulk Universality and related properties of Hermitian matrix model.- J.Stut.Phys.(2007), 130, p.205-250

[4] *L. Pastur*, The spectrum of random matrices (Russian), Teoret.Mat.Fiz.(1972), 10, p.102-112

[5] *M.L.Mehta*, Random Matrices. -Academic Press, New York (1991)

[6] *E.Brezin, S. Hikami*, Correlation of nearby levels induced by a random potential.- Nucl.Phys.(1996),479, p.697-706

[7] *E.Brezin, S. Hikami*, Extension of level-spacing universality.- Phys.Rev. E(1997),56, p.264-269

[8] *E.Brezin, S. Hikami*, Level spacing of random matrices in an external source. - Phys.Rev. E (1998), 58, p. 7176-7185

[9] *K. Johansson*, Universality of the local spacing distribution in certain ensembles of Hermitian Wigner Matrices. -Commun. Math. Phys.(2001), 215, p.683-705

[10] *P.M.Bleher., A.B.J. Kuijlaars*,Large n limit of Gaussian random matrices with external source, part II, - Commun. Math.Phys. (2004),252, p.43-76

[11] *A.I. Aptekarev, P.M. Bleher, A.B.J. Kuijlaars*, Large n limit of Gaussian random matrices with external source, part II, -Commun. Math.Phys.(2005),25,p. 367-389

[12] *T.Guhr*, Dyson's correlation function and graded symmetry.-J. Math. Phys.(1991),32(2), p.336-347

[13] *F.A. Berezin*, Introduction to superanalysis.- Reidel Pubblishing Co., Dordrecht (1987)

[14] *K. Efetov*, Supersymmetry in disorder and chaos.- "Cambridge university press" (1997)